

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



THESIS

NATO'S RESPONSE TO THE 11 SEPTEMBER 2001 TERRORISM: LESSONS LEARNED

by

Krassi Kouzmanov

March 2003

Thesis Co-Advisors:

Maria Rasmussen
David Yost

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE March 2003	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: "NATO's Response to the 11 September 2001 Terrorism: Lessons Learned"			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S): Krassi Kouzmanov				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policies or positions of the Department of Defense, the U.S. Government, the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Bulgaria, or any other Bulgarian institution.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (<i>maximum 200 words</i>) This thesis analyzes NATO's decisions and actions in response to the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks against the United States and assesses the probable future role of the Alliance in combating international terrorism. In September-October 2001 the United States chose to lead a coalition against the Al Qaida terrorists and their supporters in Afghanistan instead of ceding the initiative to NATO. The necessity for rapid decisions and action, the military capabilities gap between the United States and the European allies, and the lessons of NATO's air campaign in the 1999 Kosovo crisis probably led the United States to make this choice. NATO's contributions to the campaign against terrorism have included sending Airborne Warning and Control Systems aircraft to the United States, deploying naval forces to the Eastern Mediterranean, and conducting preventive action against terrorist groups acting within or from the Balkans. NATO's responses to the 11 September attacks, the unconventional and asymmetric threat posed by international terrorism, and the distinct contributions that the military can make in combating terrorism support the main hypothesis examined in this study: that NATO may be unable to play more than specific limited roles in the fight against international terrorism.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS: NATO, terrorism, 11 September, Article 5, Active Endeavour, Eagle Assist.			15. NUMBER OF PAGES: 81	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**NATO'S RESPONSE TO THE 11 SEPTEMBER 2001 TERRORISM:
LESSONS LEARNED**

Krassi Kouzmanov
Major, Bulgarian Army
M.S., National Army Academy, V. Tarnovo, Bulgaria, 1988

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
AND CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 2003**

Author: Krassi Kouzmanov

Approved by: Maria Rasmussen
Thesis Co-Advisor

David Yost
Thesis Co-Advisor

James Wirtz
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes NATO's decisions and actions in response to the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks against the United States and assesses the probable future role of the Alliance in combating international terrorism. In September-October 2001 the United States chose to lead a coalition against the Al Qaida terrorists and their supporters in Afghanistan instead of ceding the initiative to NATO. The necessity for rapid decisions and action, the military capabilities gap between the United States and the European allies, and the lessons of NATO's air campaign in the 1999 Kosovo crisis probably led the United States to make this choice. NATO's contributions to the campaign against terrorism have included sending Airborne Warning and Control Systems aircraft to the United States, deploying naval forces to the Eastern Mediterranean, and conducting preventive action against terrorist groups acting within or from the Balkans. NATO's responses to the 11 September attacks, the unconventional and asymmetric threat posed by international terrorism, and the distinct contributions that the military can make in combating terrorism support the main hypothesis examined in this study: that NATO may be unable to play more than specific limited roles in the fight against international terrorism.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	NATO'S RESPONSE TO 11 SEPTEMBER 2001.....	11
A.	NATO AT THE BEGINNING OF SEPTEMBER 2001	11
B.	THE ARTICLE 5 INVOCATION	15
C.	PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES.....	18
	1. Operation Eagle Assist (9 October 2001 – 16 May 2002)....	19
	2. Operation Active Endeavour (26 October 2001 – present). 20	
III.	ANALYSIS OF NATO'S RESPONSE.....	23
A.	U.S. DECISIONS IN RESPONSE TO 11 SEPTEMBER 2001	23
	1. Defining the Enemy	23
	2. Definition of the Mission and the Coalition	25
	a. <i>Coalition Partners</i>	27
	b. <i>NATO's Cohesion versus Independent Action: Implications from Operation Allied Force</i>	27
	c. <i>The Military Capabilities Gap: Implications from Operation Allied Force</i>	29
	3. Coalition Dynamics and Operation Enduring Freedom.....	33
B.	DECISIONS BY NATO AS A WHOLE.....	34
	1. The Article 5 Invocation	34
	2. Collective Measures in Support of the Campaign Against Terrorism.....	37
C.	INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT OF THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORISM	40
	1. Implications of the Operations in Afghanistan	40
	2. Post-11 September NATO-Russia Relations	43
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	47
A.	TERRORISM AS AN ASYMMETRIC THREAT	47
B.	THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN COMBATING TERRORISM	49
C.	NATO'S POSSIBLE FUTURE ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.....	53
	APPENDIX A – THE NATO AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING & CONTROL FORCE.....	59
	APPENDIX B – STANDING NAVAL FORCE MEDITERRANEAN	61
	APPENDIX C – STANDING NAVAL FORCE ATLANTIC.....	63
	APPENDIX D – OPERATION ACTIVE ENDEAVOUR: PARTICIPATING FORCES	65
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	69

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his deepest gratitude to his advisors, Professor Maria Rasmussen and Professor David Yost, for their outstanding guidance, assistance and encouragement throughout the thesis development process.

The author also thanks his family and friends for their overall support while studying at the Naval Postgraduate School.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

“At the start of the 21st century we live in a new, closely interrelated world, in which unprecedented new threats and challenges demand increasingly united responses.”¹

Rome Summit Declaration, 28 May 2002

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze NATO's decisions and actions in response to the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks against the United States and to assess the possible future role of the Alliance in combating international terrorism.

The 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks were not the first conducted by foreign terrorists against targets on U.S. soil. The differences, however, between the 2001 attacks and the World Trade Center bombing in 1993 include the results: the enormity of the death toll, owing in particular to the demolition of the Twin Towers. The scale of the 11 September attacks revealed the vulnerability of the United States and its allies. Nevertheless, the 1993 bombing and the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City in 1995 had already proved that the United States could not remain safe from terrorism at home.

The West European states have had much greater experience in tackling domestic terrorism; they have also encountered several terrorist attacks with international dimensions. Examples of such attacks include the Munich Olympics massacre in 1972 (9 hostages killed),² the hijacking of the Lufthansa flight to

¹ “NATO-Russia Relations: A New Quality.” Declaration by Heads of State and Government of NATO Member States and the Russian Federation (28 May 2002), available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/b020528e.htm>> (3 February 2003).

² Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 72.

Mogadishu in 1977 (all hostages rescued),³ the attacks on the Rome and Vienna airports in 1985 (19 people killed),⁴ the *Achille Lauro* hijacking in 1985 (1 passenger killed),⁵ the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988 (270 people killed),⁶ and the bombing of the French UTA flight over Chad in 1989 (171 passengers killed).⁷

The subject of this thesis is important because the 11 September attacks led to the first invocation and implementation of Article 5 in the history of the Alliance. Moreover, at that moment the NATO allies had to react not against an opposing superpower or a hostile alliance of states (the contingency for which NATO had prepared itself for decades), but against a network of non-state actors with activities both external and internal to Alliance territory.

The principle of collective defense represents the essence of NATO. According to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, an armed attack against one ally will be considered as an attack against all allies and each ally will assist, individually and collectively, the attacked ally. Special circumstances, however, led to the invocation of Article 5 in response to the 11 September attacks. First, these attacks were perpetrated from abroad. Second, the attacks were obviously prepared not by isolated terrorists, but by a well-organized international network. Third, in 1998 Osama bin Laden had already declared war on the United States, the United Kingdom, and their allies. The 11 September attacks were part of a series of terrorist acts conducted by Al Qaida and/or other networked Islamic fundamentalist terrorist organizations. These included the attacks on U.S. military installations in Saudi Arabia in 1995 and 1996 (24 people killed),⁸ on the

³ Paul Wilkinson, Terrorism and the Liberal State (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1986), 144.

⁴ Jeffrey Simon, The Terrorist Trap: America's Experience with Terrorism (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), 196.

⁵ Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, 144.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 190.

⁸ John Arquilla, David Ronfeldt, and Michele Zanini, "Networks, Netwar and Information-Age Terrorism," in Ian O. Lesser et al. Countering the New Terrorism (Santa Monica, CA and Washington D.C.: RAND, 1999), 61.

U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 (260 people killed),⁹ and on the *USS Cole* in 2000 (17 people killed).¹⁰ The 11 September 2001 attacks led the United States and its allies to the understanding that international terrorism is one of the greatest threats to world peace.

NATO's military forces are designed to achieve predominance in conventional warfare against conventional enemies. For over forty years these forces had been developed to deter and defend against Soviet-led forces in Europe. Terrorism is not, however, a traditional military tactic; it is a tactic employed by non-state actors (acting independently or with state sponsorship) in attempts to influence state policies and to achieve their desired ends. Martha Crenshaw considers terrorism a "form of violent coercion, a bargaining process based on the power to hurt and intimidate as a substitute for the use of overt military force."¹¹

[T]errorism is an attractive strategy to groups of different ideological persuasions who challenge the state's authority. Groups who want to dramatize a cause, to demoralize the government, to gain popular support, to provoke regime violence, to inspire followers, or to dominate a wider resistance movement, who are weak vis-à-vis the regime, and who are impatient to act, often find terrorism a reasonable choice.¹²

Terrorist tactics have never respected military conventions. Terrorists are not conventional soldiers: they do not wear uniforms, they usually do not have insignia, and they do not move and fight within easily identifiable combat units. They could be virtually everywhere; and they could hit anywhere. "Society as well as the state may be perceived as the enemy – the bourgeoisie, for example, or capitalism. The enemy may even be international; multinational capitalism is

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Simon, xiv.

¹¹ Martha Crenshaw, "Theories of Terrorism: Instrumental and Organizational Approaches," in *Inside Terrorist Organizations*, ed. David C. Rapoport (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 13.

¹² Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics*, 13:4, 1981, 379-399: 389.

often a common enemy of the radical right and the radical left.”¹³ Victims of terrorism could be both politicians and ordinary citizens; both governmental and non-governmental targets could be attacked. “The victims or objects of [a] terrorist attack have little intrinsic value to the terrorist group but represent a larger human audience whose reaction the terrorists seek.”¹⁴

Contemporary terrorism is becoming more internationalized, more diverse, more networked, and more lethal.¹⁵ The development of air transport, communications, the Internet, and international banking; and the greater opportunities for free movement between the Schengen area member states of the European Union have contributed to the internationalization of terrorism. As Bruce Hoffman has pointed out,

“[The] new terrorist organizations embrace far more amorphous religious and millenarian aims and wrap themselves in less-cohesive organizational entities, with a more-diffuse structure and membership.”¹⁶ John Arquilla, David Ronfeldt, and Michele Zanini argue that “[t]errorism seems to be evolving in the direction of violent netwar.”¹⁷ They define netwar as “an emerging mode of conflict and crime at societal levels, involving measures short of traditional war, in which the protagonists use network forms of organization and related doctrines, strategies, and technologies attuned to the information age.”¹⁸

Terrorism’s increased lethality is a “result of a handful of so-called terrorist ‘spectaculars’ – that is, the dramatic, attention-riveting, high-lethality acts that so effectively capture the attention of the media and public alike.”¹⁹ Bruce Hoffman suggests five reasons for terrorism’s increased lethality:

¹³ Martha Crenshaw, “Decisions to Use Terrorism: Psychological Constraints on Instrumental Reasons,” in International Social Movement Research, ed. Donatella della Porta, vol. 4, 1992, 29-42: 34.

¹⁴ Crenshaw, “The Causes of Terrorism,” 379.

¹⁵ Ian O. Lesser, “Countering the New Terrorism: Implications for Strategy,” in Ian O. Lesser et al. Countering the New Terrorism (Santa Monica, CA and Washington D.C.: RAND, 1999), 87.

¹⁶ Bruce Hoffman, “Terrorism Trends and Prospects,” in Lesser et al., 9.

¹⁷ Arquilla, Ronfeldt, and Zanini, 56.

¹⁸ Ibid., 47.

¹⁹ Hoffman, “Terrorism Trends and Prospects,” 12.

First, there appears to be a pattern that suggests that at least some terrorists have come to believe that attention is no longer as readily obtained as it once was. To their minds, both the public and media have become increasingly inured or desensitized to the continuing spiral of terrorist violence.²⁰

Second, terrorists have profited from past experience and have become more adept at killing. Not only are their weapons becoming smaller, more sophisticated, and deadlier, but terrorists have greater access to these weapons through their alliances with various rogue states.²¹

[The] third reason for terrorism's increased lethality, and one closely tied to the above point, is the active role played by states in supporting and sponsoring terrorism.²²

Fourth, the overall increase during the past 15 years of terrorism motivated by a religious imperative encapsulates the confluence of new adversaries, motivations, and tactics affecting terrorist patterns today.²³

Fifth, the proliferation of amateurs taking part in terrorist acts has also contributed to terrorism's increased lethality.²⁴

While the intensity of political terrorism may be decreasing, that of ethnic and religious terrorism appears to be increasing:

Terrorism in the 1970s and 1980s consisted largely of radical left-wing groups in Europe and South America with definable goals – however unattainable. The new breed of terrorist attacking the West has few aims. They just want to kill and punish for what they believe is Western imperialism and the global oppression of Muslims. In their eyes it is guilt by association.²⁵

Hoffman argues that the reasons for the greater lethality of religious terrorism in comparison with secular forms reside in its core characteristics:

²⁰ Ibid., 13.

²¹ Ibid., 14.

²² Ibid., 14.

²³ Ibid., 15.

²⁴ Ibid., 20.

²⁵ Simon Reeve, The New Jackals: Ramzi Yousef, Osama bin Laden and the Future of Terrorism (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1999), 4.

different value systems, concepts of morality, and mechanisms of legitimization and justification:

For the religious terrorist, violence is a sacramental act of divine duty, executed in direct response to some theological demand or imperative and justified by scripture. Religion therefore functions as a legitimizing force, specifically sanctioning wide-scale violence against an almost open-ended category of opponents (i.e., all people who are not members of the religious terrorists' religion or cult).²⁶

The 11 September attacks were shocking, surprising and sobering for all NATO allies. They tested the unity and the decisiveness of the Alliance. Moreover, they presented a challenge to NATO's capabilities to react rapidly with military force. This thesis analyzes the effectiveness of NATO's participation in the campaign against international terrorism. The thesis also considers the possible role of the military in combating terrorism as a basis for its examination of NATO's possible future contributions to this struggle.

The Atlantic Alliance's solidarity and the perception of a common threat were the leading factors for the Article 5 implementation. However, NATO as a whole was not prepared to take part in the campaign in Afghanistan. In September-October 2001 the United States had to choose between a NATO-led or a U.S.-led campaign. Some Americans appear to have perceived it as a choice between (a) the political advantages of NATO-led action and (b) the operational advantages of U.S.-led action. The necessity of fast decisions and rapid action, the military capabilities gap between the United States and the European allies, and the experience from NATO's Operation Allied Force in the 1999 Kosovo crisis defined the United States' decision, in the words of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, that "The mission must determine the coalition."²⁷ That is, Washington chose to lead a coalition of states having the necessary anti-

²⁶ Hoffman, "Terrorism Trends and Prospects," 19.

²⁷ Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, remarks at National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., 31 January 2002, available at <http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s20020131-secdef.html> (10 January 2003).

terrorist assets with sufficient sustainability and their own airlift and sealift capabilities.

This decision reveals one of the major problems which NATO has yet to solve: defining the Alliance's roles and missions for the twenty-first century. At this stage contradictions exist between declaring the campaign against terrorism as one of NATO's main goals and the limited opportunities for realization of this goal. The asymmetric threat that terrorism poses requires asymmetric responses. Massed military power cannot be fully effective against dispersed terrorists who are difficult to distinguish from ordinary citizens. Additionally, since terrorism has both internal and external dimensions, domestic law-enforcement and intelligence agencies bear major responsibilities for dealing with terrorist threats.

In practice, the involvement of NATO as a military alliance in the campaign against terrorism has included sending Airborne Warning and Control Systems (AWACS) aircraft to the United States, sending naval forces to the Eastern Mediterranean to demonstrate NATO's solidarity and resolve, and conducting preventive action by NATO's peacekeeping forces against terrorist groups acting within or from the Balkans.²⁸

The scope of NATO's reaction to the 11 September attacks, the characteristics of international terrorism as an unconventional and asymmetric threat, and the relatively small contribution that the military could make in combating terrorism constitute factors that support the main hypothesis examined in this study: that NATO may be unable to play more than a limited role in the fight against international terrorism. However, the Alliance may yet be able to make greater contributions in preventive and protective functions. It also could use its developed mechanisms for crisis and consequence management in responses to terrorist attacks. NATO contributions could be valuable in the following areas, among others: counterproliferation operations against adversaries armed with weapons of mass destruction (WMD); assistance to

²⁸ "Terrorism and the Emergence of New Threats." NATO Handbook, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0106.htm>> (24 November 2002).

states that have suffered WMD terrorist attacks; and further dialogue and cooperation with Russia, Ukraine, and other Partnership for Peace partners, as well as the countries participating in the Mediterranean Dialogue. The NATO Response Force, approved at the NATO Summit in Prague in November 2002 and to achieve full operational capability no later than October 2006, could be used for collective defense and/or for implementation and enforcement of decisions of the United Nations Security Council directed towards neutralizing threats posed by terrorism.

The thesis considers the following questions:

A. How did NATO react immediately after 11 September 2001? What decisions did NATO make in response to these attacks?

B. What decisions did the United States make about the participation of allies in the campaign against Al Qaida and the Taliban leadership in Afghanistan?

C. What actions did NATO undertake in the campaign against international terrorism in the period from September 2001 through May 2002?

D. What could the future role of NATO be in the struggle against international terrorism?

This thesis employs descriptive and analytical approaches to answer these questions. It describes NATO activities in response to the 11 September attacks, and then analyzes NATO's responses and potential future role in the campaign against international terrorism. To trace the events forming NATO's response to the 11 September attacks, the thesis relies on information published in official NATO sources. The analytical part of the thesis draws on official statements and various interpretations of NATO's activities and potential future role in combating international terrorism.

The analysis encompasses the following elements: NATO's reaction in response to the 11 September attacks; the U.S. decisions about the participation of allies in the campaign against terrorism; NATO's support to the U.S.-led

campaign; the international context of the U.S. and UN operations in Afghanistan; and the future role of NATO in the struggle against international terrorism.

The thesis is organized as follows. The second chapter describes NATO's post-11 September decisions and actions. The third chapter analyzes NATO's response. The last chapter offers conclusions and discusses implications for the future.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. NATO'S RESPONSE TO 11 SEPTEMBER 2001

This chapter chronologically traces the decisions that NATO made in response to the 11 September attacks, and the actions that the Alliance undertook in support of the U.S.-led Operation Enduring Freedom. These decisions include the invocation and implementation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, sending NATO AWACS aircraft in support of U.S. airspace surveillance, deploying naval forces in the eastern Mediterranean, and collectively and individually implementing other measures requested by the United States. In order to create a better understanding of NATO's priorities at the beginning of September 2001, this chapter initially reviews the most significant processes of the last decade of the 20th century that shaped NATO's roles and missions.

The world changed on 11 September 2001. This phrase, which has already become a cliché, applies to many areas of public life. Without any doubt, this date will leave a profound imprint on the history of the modern world. It has initiated processes that likely mark the beginning of a new epoch in international relations and global security. However, 11 September significantly influenced processes that had already started after the end of the Cold War.

A. NATO AT THE BEGINNING OF SEPTEMBER 2001

One of the most significant dates in the end of the last century is 1 July 1991. It marks not only the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact but also the end of the East-West bloc-to-bloc opposition. On 25 December 1991, the Soviet Union collapsed and gave birth to fifteen independent successor states. In the beginning of the 1990s, most of the former socialist countries made their choice for democratization and started the processes of democratic transition and consolidation. A process of dissolution began also in Yugoslavia in 1991, but most of the states faced Serbia's armed resistance, which ignited a series of wars within the federation.

Thérèse Delpech characterizes succinctly the post-Cold War period:

Granted, new trends distinct from the Cold War were emerging. A limited, regional war in the Persian Gulf had gathered together one of the major coalitions in the history of warfare. Three major actors – the United States, Russia, and China – worked with a curious mix of cooperation and confrontation. Intrastate wars were blooming in the Balkans, Indonesia, Central Asia, and Africa, but ethnic rivalries were hardly the only feature of these conflicts, even in the chaos of Africa. Globalization was an economic, rather than strategic, concept and its very meaning remained elusive. The information revolution was changing the nature of the conflict, but exactly how was difficult to assess.²⁹

The changing situation in Europe required adequate reaction from NATO; the Alliance had to define “new roles in addition to its traditional core missions of collective defense and dialogue with adversaries.”³⁰ According to David Yost, “the two most significant new roles are clearly cooperation with former adversaries and other non-NATO countries in new institutions such as Partnership for Peace, and crisis management and peace operations beyond the territory of NATO allies.”³¹

NATO established several vehicles for dialogue and cooperation with the former members of the Warsaw Pact and with other non-NATO countries: Partnership for Peace, the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC), the NATO-Ukraine Commission, the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (replaced in May 1997 by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council [EAPC]), and the Mediterranean Dialogue.

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO-Russia relations have gained significant importance with regard to the future of Europe. “No issue is more central to the Alliance’s goal of building a peaceful political order in Europe than relations with Russia.”³² Initially Russia expected the disbandment of NATO as a

²⁹ Thérèse Delpech, “The Imbalance of Terror,” *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 25 (Winter 2002), 31-40: 31. Available at <<http://www.twq.com/02winter/delpech.pdf>> (9 January 2003).

³⁰ David Yost, *NATO Transformed: The Alliance’s New Roles in International Security* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1998), 72.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 72.

³² *Ibid.*, 131.

reciprocal step in response to the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. NATO's decisions to adapt itself to the changes and to play a key role in European security affairs had influenced Russia's position. "The issue whether Russia could conceivably join the Alliance was an important one in the period from the end of 1991 through the middle of 1993."³³ However, by the end of 1993 Russia had changed its stance toward opposition to the expansion of NATO. In 1994-1995 the Alliance managed to engage Russia in greater cooperation by establishing a formalized consultation process in a "16+1" format and inviting Russian troops to serve alongside the NATO forces in the peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina.³⁴

The Mediterranean Dialogue, initiated in 1994, aimed "to establish contacts, on a case-by-case basis, between the Alliance and Mediterranean countries with a view to contributing to the strengthening of regional security."³⁵ Within this initiative, NATO has established bilateral cooperation so far with Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia.

In 1999 NATO accepted three new members: the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland. Until the Prague Summit (22 November 2002), one of the Alliance's main preoccupations was the future of the enlargement process. At Prague the allies decided to invite seven countries (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia) to join the Alliance.

During the 1990s, NATO faced new challenges requiring military responses. Operation Desert Shield (1990-1991) and Operation Desert Storm (1991) were conducted by a U.S.-led coalition. The role of NATO was limited to providing support to Turkey in case of a potential Iraqi attack against this ally. The operations finished without such NATO involvement. In the period 1992-1995 the Alliance conducted embargo and no-fly-zone enforcement operations with reference to conflicts in the former Yugoslavia.

³³ Stuart Croft et al. The Enlargement of Europe (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1999), 38.

³⁴ Ibid., 38-40.

³⁵ North Atlantic Council Final Communiqué, 1 December 1994, par.19.

In December 1996, the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR) replaced the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina. IFOR was established in December 1995 after NATO intervened in the Bosnia conflict with Operation Deliberate Force. With this move, NATO aimed not only to stabilize the Balkans but also to demonstrate its unity and its concern for peace and security in Europe. However, this move was preceded by “the worst crisis in NATO since 1956,”³⁶ owing to the reluctance of the U.S. Administration to deploy American troops along with those of some European allies, principally Britain and France, in the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in 1992-1995.

The Alliance’s Strategic Concept, adopted in 1999, has broadened the range of the contingences that could pose threats to the security of the member countries and has expanded the scope of NATO from regional security to global security:

Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage and organised crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources. The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people, particularly as a consequence of armed conflicts, can also pose problems for security and stability affecting the Alliance.³⁷

Operation Allied Force (1999), conducted in response to Serbian atrocities in Kosovo, was the largest combat operation in the history of the Alliance to date. This operation is also significant because it was conducted without an explicit authorization by the U.N. Security Council. Despite its success, Operation Allied Force revealed some cracks in the allies’ unity related to the decision-making process and the parameters of the operation. This operation increased tension between NATO and Russia and led Russia to suspend its cooperation with the Alliance. However, the participation of Russian troops in the NATO-led Kosovo

³⁶ Ivo Daalder, “Anthony Lake and the War in Bosnia” (Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Pew Case Studies in International Affairs # 467, 1995), 1.

³⁷ “The Alliance’s Strategic Concept,” approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999, par. 24, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm>> (22 November 2002).

Force (KFOR) reduced this tension. More extensive NATO-Russia dialogue and cooperation resumed in early 2000.

B. THE ARTICLE 5 INVOCATION

Only a few hours after the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001, NATO released a statement condemning the attacks. In the evening of 11 September the North Atlantic Council (NAC) expressed its solidarity with the United States and declared that the United States could rely on its allies for assistance and support. The NAC underlined “the urgency of intensifying the battle against terrorism, a battle that NATO countries – indeed all civilized nations – must win.”³⁸ The Council also announced the allies’ decision “to stand united in their determination to combat this scourge.”³⁹ In a separate statement, the NATO Secretary General, Lord George Robertson, declared: “These barbaric acts constitute intolerable aggression against democracy and underline the need for the international community and the members of the Alliance to unite their forces in fighting the scourge of terrorism.”⁴⁰

On the next day, 12 September, the NAC conditionally invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty. The Council declared that, “if it is determined that this attack was directed from abroad against the United States, it shall be regarded as an action covered by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which states that an armed attack against one or more of the Allies in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”⁴¹ In the same statement the NAC reiterated the allies’ readiness to provide the required assistance to the United States. On the same day, the EAPC also condemned the terrorist attacks and expressed its solidarity with the United States. The Council unequivocally

³⁸ Statement by the North Atlantic Council, 11 September 2001, NATO Press Release (2001)122, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-122e.htm>> (21 December 2002).

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Statement by the Secretary General of NATO Lord Robertson, 11 September 2001, NATO Press Release (2001)121, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-121e.htm>> (21 December 2002).

⁴¹ Statement by the North Atlantic Council, 12 September 2001, NATO Press Release (2001)124, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-124e.htm>> (21 December 2002).

declared the resolve of its members⁴² to participate actively in the fight against terrorism: “We pledge to undertake all efforts to combat the scourge of terrorism.”⁴³

In the next two days, the Alliance gained support from two important partners: Russia and Ukraine. Despite the participation of these countries in the abovementioned EAPC statement, the NATO-Russia PJC and the NATO-Ukraine Commission released separate statements.

The NATO-Russia PJC expressed the determination of both parties to intensify their cooperation to defeat terrorism. NATO member countries and Russia declared that they were “united in their resolve not to let those responsible for such an inhuman act to go unpunished.”⁴⁴ They also appealed to “the entire international community to unite in the struggle against terrorism.”⁴⁵

In its statement the NATO-Ukraine Commission described the 11 September terrorist attacks as “directed against the very foundation of democracy and freedom throughout the world.”⁴⁶ Ukraine also offered its support to allies’ efforts in fighting terrorism.⁴⁷

On 20 September 2002, the Deputy Secretary of State of the United States, Richard Armitage, visited the NATO Headquarters and briefed the

⁴² The members of the EAPC are: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tadjikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Uzbekistan. The list is available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-123e.htm>> (Dec 21, 2002).

⁴³ Statement by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, 12 September 2001, NATO Press Release (2001)123, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-123e.htm>> (21 December 2002).

⁴⁴ Press Statement from the meeting in extraordinary session of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council at Ambassadorial level, 13 September 2001, available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p010913e.htm> (21 December 2002).

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Statement by the NATO-Ukraine Commission, 14 September 2001, NATO Press Release (2001)126, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-126e.htm>> (21 December 2002).

⁴⁷ Ibid.

Secretary General and the NAC on the results from the investigation of the 11 September attacks up to that date. Four main points can be derived from the released information: (a) "President Bush was putting together a grand coalition in preparation for a sustained campaign against terrorism;"⁴⁸ (b) the target of the first retaliatory strike was named: "terrorists and their infrastructure in Afghanistan;"⁴⁹ (c) the campaign would be a "global war on terrorism" which would not stop in Afghanistan;⁵⁰ and (d) the U.S. government's plans did not include a NATO-led military operation.⁵¹

On the basis of a classified briefing given by the United States Department of State Coordinator for Counter-terrorism, Ambassador Francis Taylor, the NAC on 2 October 2001 confirmed the invocation of Article 5. The briefing included the results of the investigation so far, information about Osama bin Laden and Al Qaida and their role in the 11 September 2001 attacks and in previous terrorist acts, and information about the links between Al Qaida and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan.⁵²

In his statement Lord Robertson was definite about the motives for invocation of Article 5:

The facts are clear and compelling. The information presented points conclusively to an Al-Qaida role in the 11 September attacks... On the basis of this briefing, it has now been determined that the attack against the United States on 11 September was directed from abroad and shall therefore be regarded as an action covered by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty...⁵³

⁴⁸ "High-level US official at NATO HQ." NATO Update, 20 September 2001, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/0917/e0920a.htm>> (21 December 2002).

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Press Availability: U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, 20 September 2001, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/s010920a.htm>> (21 December 2002).

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Statement by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson, 2 October 2001, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/s011002a.htm>> (21 December 2002).

⁵³ Ibid.

However, at that moment it was still unclear “what military action would be taken by the Alliance, be it individually or collectively.”⁵⁴

C. PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES

The invocation of Article 5 took effect on 4 October 2001, when the NAC adopted eight measures requested by the United States, to be taken “individually and collectively, to expand the options available in the campaign against terrorism.”⁵⁵ The allies agreed to

- enhance intelligence sharing and co-operation, both bilaterally and in the appropriate NATO bodies, relating to the threats posed by terrorism and the actions to be taken against it;
- provide, individually or collectively, as appropriate and according to their capabilities, assistance to Allies and other states which are or may be subject to increased terrorist threats as a result of their support for the campaign against terrorism;
- take necessary measures to provide increased security for facilities of the United States and other Allies on their territory;
- backfill selected Allied assets in NATO’s area of responsibility that are required to directly support operations against terrorism;
- provide blanket overflight clearances for the United States and other Allies’ aircraft, in accordance with the necessary air traffic arrangements and national procedures, for military flights related to operations against terrorism;
- provide access for the United States and other Allies to ports and airfields on the territory of NATO nations for operations against terrorism, including for refuelling, in accordance with national procedures.⁵⁶

The NAC also declared the Alliance’s readiness “to deploy elements of its Standing Naval Forces to the Eastern Mediterranean in order to provide a NATO

⁵⁴ “Invocation of Article 5 Confirmed.” NATO Update, 2 October 2001, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/1001/e1002a.htm>> (8 February 2003).

⁵⁵ Lord George Robertson, Statement to the Press on the North Atlantic Council Decision on Implementation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty following the 11 September Attacks against the United States, 4 October 2001, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/s011004b.htm>> (24 November 2002).

⁵⁶ Ibid.

presence and demonstrate resolve”⁵⁷ and “to deploy elements of its NATO Airborne Early Warning force to support operations against terrorism.”⁵⁸

1. Operation Eagle Assist (9 October 2001 – 16 May 2002)

In response to the U.S. request and in fulfillment of the NAC decision on 4 October, on 9 October 2001 the NATO Airborne Early Warning Force (NAEWF) (see Appendix 1) started deployment of five Airborne Warning and Control Systems aircraft (AWACS) to the United States from their main base in Geilenkirchen, Germany. The NATO aircraft were deployed to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, in support of the 552nd Air Control Wing (ACW). At that time, the 552nd ACW was engaged in four theaters of operation. Its aircraft were participating in Operations Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan), Northern Watch, and Southern Watch (the no-flying zones in Iraq). The ACW was also providing radar coverage over the United States in support of the North American Aerospace Defense Command’s (NORAD) mission, Operation Noble Eagle.⁵⁹

The AWACS provides an air surveillance and early warning capability which greatly enhances effective command and control of NATO forces by enabling data to be transmitted directly from the aircraft to command and control centres on the ground, sea or in the air. There are 24 AWACS in the NATO fleet, based at Geilenkirchen, Germany, and RAF Waddington in the United Kingdom.⁶⁰

Operation Eagle Assist was aimed at enabling the United States to use its own AWACS aircraft in the campaign against terrorism, “to enhance NORAD’s capability to continue combat air patrol missions and to lower the operational tempo of the U.S. AWACS fleet.”⁶¹ On 16 January 2002, responding to a

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Steve Rolenc, “Tinker, NATO defend America hand in hand,” available at <http://www-ext.tinker.af.mil/pa/archive/20011019/01-NATO_AWACS.htm> (6 February 2003).

⁶⁰ “NATO Airborne Early Warning Aircraft Begin Deploying To The United States,” available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/1008/e1009b.htm>> (6 February 2003).

⁶¹ Rolenc, “Tinker, NATO...”

request by the United States, the NAC approved the deployment of two more AWACS aircraft in the United States.⁶²

Operation Eagle Assist ended on 16 May 2002. “The NAC decided to conclude the mission following air defense upgrades in the United States and an assessment of US homeland security requirements.”⁶³ Within the operation, in which 830 crewmembers from 13 NATO nations took part, the NATO AWACS aircraft flew nearly 4300 hours in over 360 operational sorties.⁶⁴

2. Operation Active Endeavour (26 October 2001 – present)

Following the decision of the NAC, on 6 October 2001 the Standing Naval Forces Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED) (see Appendix 2) were withdrawn from the Exercise Destined Glory 2001 and re-deployed in the Eastern Mediterranean to conduct Operation Active Endeavour. The activation order was issued on 26 October, and this date marks the formal beginning of the operation.⁶⁵ “The operation’s mission is to conduct naval operations in the Eastern Mediterranean to actively demonstrate NATO’s resolve and solidarity.”⁶⁶ Operation Active Endeavour is conducted by the Commander Allied Naval Forces Southern Europe (COMNAVSOUTH), whose headquarters is located in Naples, Italy. The operation is executed by Task Force Endeavour.⁶⁷

The Standing Naval Forces Atlantic (STANAVFORLANT) (see Appendix 3), as well as STANAVFORMED, are part of NATO’s Immediate Reaction Forces

⁶² “NATO Sends Extra AWACS to Help Guard Skies of America,” 16 January 2002, NATO Press Release (2002)003, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-003e.htm>> (3 January 2003).

⁶³ “NATO Secretary General Visit to NATO AWACS Air Base Geilenkirchen, Germany on Tuesday, 16 May 2002,” 14 May 2002, NATO Press Release (2002)065, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-065e.htm>> (3 January 2003).

⁶⁴ Statement by the Secretary General on the conclusion of Operation Eagle Assist, 30 April 2002, NATO Press Release (2002)065, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-057e.htm>> (3 January 2003).

⁶⁵ “Operation Active Endeavour,” available at <<http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/Endeavour/default.htm>> (8 February 2003).

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

(IRF) and are trained to deploy rapidly and to conduct a broad range of maritime operations.⁶⁸ Both STANAVFORMED and STANAVFORLANT are made up of ships from various allied nations and are subordinated respectively to the COMNAVSOUTH and to the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic (SACLANT).⁶⁹

Task Force Endeavour (TFE) initially consisted of eight ships from STANAVFORMED. During the first two months of the operation, about 1700 merchant vessels were monitored and the shipborne helicopters were flown more than 1000 hours.⁷⁰ On 6 December 2001, STANAVFORLANT, consisting of eleven ships, replaced STANAVFORMED and assumed responsibility for the operation in the Eastern Mediterranean. The STANAVFORMED vessels returned to national ports for home leave and maintenance. On 14 January 2002, STANAVFORMED again replaced STANAVFORLANT. Since then these two forces have rotated approximately every three months (see Appendix 4).⁷¹

On 6 December 2001, the NAC summarized the implementation of its decisions in support of the campaign against terrorism, which were taken after the invocation of Article 5:

[W]e have decided to support, individually and collectively, the ongoing US-led military operations against the terrorists who perpetrated the 11 September outrages and those who provide them sanctuary. NATO surveillance aircraft are patrolling US airspace, for the first time ever. Alliance naval forces have deployed to the eastern Mediterranean to demonstrate NATO's solidarity and resolve. Our peacekeeping forces in the Balkans, with the support of countries of the region, have been acting to prevent terrorist groups from operating within and from the Balkans. Individual Allies have offered forces and other assets to the campaign against terrorism and for use in humanitarian relief. We will continue our

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Nations contributing to STANAVFORMED are: Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Contributors to STANAVFORLANT are: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Composition of forces varies (see Appendix 4).

⁷⁰ "Operation Active Endeavour..."

⁷¹ Ibid.

support to the United States for the US-led operation against these terrorists until it has reached its objectives. We will provide this support in accordance with our decisions and in full compliance with all our commitments under international law and relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.⁷²

This chapter has described the actions which NATO took collectively in response to the U.S. request after the 11 September terrorist attacks. Immediately after the attacks NATO demonstrated its determination to act as an alliance and to implement its core principle of collective defense. However, the collective support that the United States required was limited to eight specific measures, including assistance to the U.S. air defense system and a demonstration of NATO's "resolve and solidarity" in the Eastern Mediterranean. Thus the question about NATO's possible leading role in combating international terrorism received its answer. The abovementioned decisions "clearly demonstrate the Allies' resolve and commitment to support and contribute to the U.S.-led fight against terrorism."⁷³ The United States decided to organize and to lead the operation against the perpetrators of the 11 September attacks and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, which was providing Al Qaida terrorists a safe haven. It became clear that Washington allotted NATO a secondary, supportive role in the campaign against terrorism.

⁷² "NATO's Response to Terrorism." Statement issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 6 December 2001. NATO Press Release M-NAC-2 (2001)159, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-159e.htm>> (10 September 2002).

⁷³ Lord George Robertson, Statement to the Press on the North Atlantic Council Decision on Implementation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty following the 11 September Attacks against the United States, 4 October 2001...

III. ANALYSIS OF NATO'S RESPONSE

This chapter first analyzes the decisions of the U.S. government about how to organize and conduct retaliatory operations against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and the Al Qaida network. This includes decisions about the strategy of the campaign and the motives for inviting specific allies to participate in Operation Enduring Freedom. The United States had recently participated in the NATO-led Operation Allied Force in the Kosovo conflict (March-June 1999). Despite its success, this operation demonstrated the gap between the military capabilities of the United States and those of its allies and the difficulties in achieving consensus among the allies on the scope and duration of the operation and on the target approval procedures. Moreover, Operation Allied Force raised concerns resulting (a) from internal legislative obstacles that some allies had faced during their participation in the operation, and/or (b) from long-standing good relations between certain allies and Serbia. The lessons learned from the Kosovo air campaign inevitably influenced the U.S. government in making decisions about a U.S.-led anti-terrorist coalition. The chapter then analyzes NATO's decisions and actions in the period from September 2001 to May 2002 related to the campaign against terrorism. Finally, the chapter discusses the international participation in Operation Enduring Freedom and analyzes the possible implications of this campaign for NATO as a whole, notably with regard to the role of military forces in combating terrorism.

A. U.S. DECISIONS IN RESPONSE TO 11 SEPTEMBER 2001

1. Defining the Enemy

A few hours after the attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) revealed the identity of the hijackers: fifteen Saudis, two citizens of the United Arab Emirates, one Lebanese, and one Egyptian. The delayed travel bag of Mohamed Atta, the suicide pilot of American Airlines Flight 11 and presumed mastermind of the nineteen terrorists, provided a great source of information about the motives and

the mindsets of the attackers. The papers found in the bag contained instructions for terrorists on suicide missions and Atta's last will and testament.⁷⁴

Immediately after the attacks, suspicions about a possible link between Osama bin Laden and the attacks arose among U.S. officials. The former SACEUR, retired General Wesley Clark, suspected that bin Laden was responsible for the terrorist acts. Al Qaida was considered the only terrorist organization capable of organizing and conducting such an operation.⁷⁵ The "largest operation in the history of the FBI" soon gave results. Coordinated investigations in the United States and Germany discovered links between the attackers and Al Qaida operatives in Germany. The results of the investigation gave President George W. Bush reason to declare before the Congress on 20 September 2001: "Our war on terror begins with al-Qaida, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated."⁷⁶

The location of bin Laden was relatively clear: since 1996 he had enjoyed a safe haven in Afghanistan provided by the Taliban regime. The U.S. administration asked the Afghanistan government to surrender its "guest" to the United States. When it became obvious that the Taliban did not intend to cooperate, the United States started preparations for a retaliatory campaign. The short-term aims of the operation were that Osama bin Laden and the other perpetrators of the 11 September attacks be apprehended and brought to justice, that the Al Qaida installations in Afghanistan be destroyed, and that the Taliban regime be toppled. The long-term objective was proclaimed by President Bush: a global war on terrorism (GWOT).⁷⁷ U.S. policy in this campaign, according to

⁷⁴ Der Spiegel Magazine, Inside 9-11: What Really Happened (New York: St. Martin Press, 2002), 142-313.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 141-167.

⁷⁶ President George W. Bush address to Joint Session of Congress, 20 September 2001, in United States Department of State, Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001 (May 2002), i.

⁷⁷ The term *war on terrorism* seems to be imperfect. A war is presupposed to have a beginning and an end. If the end of the war on terrorism is to be marked by defeating all terrorist groups of global reach, this endeavor could be open-ended. Martha Crenshaw argues that "terrorism may be a 'cycle of vengeance,' leading to its self perpetuation." (Crenshaw, "Decisions to Use Terrorism...", 36). In this thesis, the term *campaign against terrorism* is more applicable.

the State Department's *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001*, is based on four principles:

- Making no concessions to terrorists and striking no deals;
- Bringing terrorists to justice for their crimes;
- Isolating and applying pressure on states sponsoring terrorism to force them to change their behavior;
- Bolstering the counterterrorist capabilities of those countries that work with the United States and require assistance.⁷⁸

2. Definition of the Mission and the Coalition

The short-term mission required a specific approach in defining the most appropriate coalition. The U.S. administration had to choose between at least three options in regard to the forthcoming campaign:

- The U.S. forces could act alone;
- The United States could organize a broad coalition; or
- NATO could take the lead and conduct the campaign.

The first option had probably been excluded in the very first days after 11 September. The disclosures about the international character of the terrorist network that conducted the attacks and the experiences of other countries from their military campaigns in Afghanistan may have influenced the U.S. decision to seek broad international support for a U.S.-led campaign.

Al Qaeda has at its disposal between three thousand and five thousand active members in some fifty countries... Terrorist subgroups that have become largely subsumed into the network or that are collaborating closely with them include the al Gama'a al-Islamiya in Egypt, the Algerian Armed Islamic Group, the Yemenite group Dscheisch Aden, the Abu Sayyaf group in the Philippines, and the Pakistani Kashmir Liberation Front. Connections to the Palestinian group Hamas and to Hezbollah, which are financed by Iran, are looser.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001*, xii-xiii.

⁷⁹ *Der Spiegel Magazine*, 175.

Afghanistan had historically been a graveyard for foreign invaders. Both the British and the Soviets had had bitter experiences in their campaigns in that country. A new foreign invasion could be used by the Taliban regime and the religious leaders to motivate large segments of the population to resist the invaders. Such resistance could significantly complicate the tasks of the U.S.-led forces while giving additional time to the key Al Qaida leaders to evacuate.

These facts, the operational need for bases close to Afghanistan, and the risk that some terrorists might flee to neighboring countries defined the need for coalition partners not only among Afghanistan's neighbors but also on a broader basis. The United States recognized that it could gain an important internal ally – the Northern Alliance, an armed group resisting the Taliban regime. The Northern Alliance was able to provide forces for the land offensive and could frustrate the Taliban's efforts to unify the population and organize national resistance against the foreign forces.

The U.S. decision to favor a U.S.-led coalition instead of a NATO-led coalition is one of the central themes of this thesis. The U.S. administration decided that the mission had to determine the most suitable coalition. The decision about the mission and the coalition was taken within a week after 11 September. On 20 September 2001, Richard Armitage, the Deputy Secretary of State, informed the NAC of President Bush's efforts to arrange a grand coalition. This meant that the United States had decided to take the lead in organizing the impending campaign.

At least three considerations may have played a role in the U.S. decision to organize a U.S.-led broad antiterrorist campaign instead of a NATO-led operation: (a) the need to involve in the coalition a broad range of partners from all over the world – both states and sub-state actors (such as the Northern Alliance); (b) the preference to avoid constraints on U.S. latitude that might arise in a NATO-led operation and to guarantee the speed and freedom of an independent action through a U.S.-led campaign, i.e., to implement the lessons

learned from the NATO-led Operation Allied Force in Kosovo; and (c) the capabilities gap between the United States and the other NATO allies.

a. Coalition Partners

International terrorism cannot be defeated by the unilateral efforts of a single country. In the words of the U.S. Secretary of State, Colin Powell,

In this global campaign against terrorism, no country has the luxury of remaining on the sidelines. There **are** no sidelines. Terrorists respect no limits, geographic or moral. The frontlines are everywhere and the stakes are high. Terrorism not only kills people. It also threatens democratic institutions, undermines economies, and destabilizes regions.⁸⁰

An efficient fight against international terrorist organizations requires common and coordinated contributions in a wide range of areas: legislative, judicial, law-enforcement, military, financial, religious, etc. This option could provide the United States an opportunity to select which of the offered assets to accept and to request support in specific areas of the campaign against terrorism. Another important aspect in regard to the coalition participants was the United States gaining support and partners among the Muslim states. This would prevent possible misinterpretations and speculations that might present the campaign against terrorism as a conflict between Christianity and Islam or as a war of Western civilization against Islamic civilization.

b. NATO's Cohesion versus Independent Action: Implications from Operation Allied Force

The strikes against Al Qaida and the Taliban military installations had to be fast, surprising, and effective in order to prevent Taliban forces from re-grouping and to prevent terrorists from escaping. Some of the targets (e.g., the top Al Qaida leaders) were dynamic and their capture was expected to be heavily dependent on intelligence support. Swift changes in the required strategy and tactics could also be expected. All these factors would demand rapid decisions.

⁸⁰ Colin L. Powell, Preface by Secretary of State in Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001, iii; emphasis in the original.

On the one hand, a NATO-led operation might increase the cohesion of the Alliance and provide NATO with new roles and missions for the 21st century. Additionally, NATO could increase its importance as a factor for international security, especially after conducting a successful operation far beyond its traditional area of responsibility. On the other hand, the United States had the experience and the lessons learned from its participation in Operation Allied Force in the Kosovo conflict in 1999.

The forthcoming campaign in Afghanistan “was not the kind of war that required large numbers of military personnel, and the command and control problems of a multilingual force away from familiar NATO terrain would have been challenging.”⁸¹

Only the British had the sealift and in-flight refueling capabilities to get troops to the region under their own steam and to keep them supplied once in place... Allies might also have proved restrictive on American freedom of action, as NATO allies had an occasion been over target selection during the Kosovo bombing campaign.⁸²

During the preparation and execution of Operation Allied Force, the United States faced several difficulties with the European allies. Some of these allies had internal policies or military capability constraints affecting their participation in the operation.

Several Alliance members lacked domestic support for an offensive operation in Kosovo. In Greece, domestic opposition ran as high as 90 percent, and the Italian government feared that internal divisions over the operation could shatter its ruling coalition.⁸³

The target approval process was another area in which different national policies and bureaucratic procedures affected the speed and the effectiveness of the operation and even the safety of the allies' aircraft.

⁸¹ Martin Walker, “Post 9/11: The European Dimension,” World Policy Journal (Winter 2001/02), 1-10: 4.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ John Peters et al. “European Contributions to Operation Allied Force: Implications for Transatlantic Strategy” (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2001), 37. Available at <<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1391/MR1391.ch2.pdf>> (20 January 2003).

When Operation Allied Force commenced, NATO's Master Target File included 169 targets, of which 51 were initially approved. By the end of the operation in June 1999, it had grown to include more than 976 targets, enough to fill six volumes. Because NATO had not anticipated a long campaign, the newly nominated targets had not been developed fully in advance. Each of the additional 807 targets had to be proposed, reviewed, and approved by NATO and national authorities before being added to the master list. This cumbersome process revealed major divisions among the NATO allies and limited the military effectiveness of the operation.⁸⁴

In addition, "parallel U.S. and NATO command and control structures and systems complicated operational planning and maintenance of unity of command."⁸⁵

The United States also had concerns about sharing secret information with its NATO allies:

Even when the United States decided to share information with its allies, the process of clearing and distributing that information did not flow smoothly. Delays and restrictions consistently hindered this process, which made it hard for the NATO allies to have a full operational picture.⁸⁶

Moreover, "the United States deliberately excluded France from accessing NATO's top secret plans, in order to reduce the likelihood of leaks to Belgrade."⁸⁷

c. The Military Capabilities Gap: Implications from Operation Allied Force

The gap between the military capabilities of the United States and those of its European allies, which became obvious during Operation Allied Force, provoked concerns and debates in the Alliance. In his remarks at the

⁸⁴ Ibid., 26.

⁸⁵ American Forces Information Service, "Lessons learned from Kosovo," available at <<http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/lessons/acw.html>> (9 January 2003).

⁸⁶ Peters et al., 40.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 40.

Defence Week Conference, held in Brussels in 2000, Lord George Robertson stated:

The Kosovo air campaign demonstrated just how dependent the European Allies had become on U.S. military capabilities. From precision-guided weapons and all-weather aircraft to ground troops that can get to the crisis quickly and then stay there with adequate logistical support, the European Allies did not have enough of the right stuff.

On paper, Europe has 2 million men and women under arms – more than the United States. But despite those 2 million soldiers, it was a struggle to come up with 40,000 troops to deploy as peacekeepers in the Balkans. Something is wrong and Europe knows it.⁸⁸

Operation Allied Force demonstrated the imbalance between the U.S. and the European capabilities. The share of the U.S. contribution to the operation is impressive:

- 60% of all sorties
- 80% of all weapons delivered
- 95% of cruise missiles launched
- 650 of 927 participating aircraft
- 70% of all supporting missions
- 320 B-52, B-1, and B-2 sorties dropped half of the total of bombs delivered
- 90% of all EW [electronic warfare] assets
- all stealth assets
- all Airborne Command and Control facilities
- most of the equipment and manpower for the Combined Air Operations Center in Vicenza
- most of the Air-to-Air Refueling capability⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Lord George Robertson, "Rebalancing NATO for a Strong Future," Remarks at the Defence Week Conference, Brussels, Belgium, 31 January 2000, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2000/s000131a.htm>> (6 March 2003).

⁸⁹ According to one source, the United States provided 90% of this capability. David Yost, "The NATO Capabilities Gap and the European Union," *Survival*, vol. 42, no.4, Winter 2000-2001, 97-128: 104.

- 90% of the employed and vital mobile target acquisition capability
- most of the Combat Search and Rescue capabilities.⁹⁰

According to David Yost, “European contributions in Operation Allied Force were particularly strong in combat air patrol; air-to-ground strike operations in good weather; and in surveillance, reconnaissance, and battle-damage assessment with unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and manned aircraft such as *Tornados*, *Étendard* IVPs, and *Mirage* IVPs.”⁹¹ However, “an average of three American support aircraft was required for each European strike sortie.”⁹²

These facts suggest that in a possible Alliance military operation far beyond Europe the burden for providing support to the allies would be much greater for the United States and could degrade the speed and the effectiveness of the operation.

The RAND Corporation has presented some of the lessons learned from Operation Allied Force:

- Although Alliance and U.S. media news releases during the operation recognized the contributions of all participating air forces, the United States was responsible for a disproportionately large share of the effort. The Europeans certainly made some important contributions to combat operations... However, the allies generally lacked the level of precision and all-weather capabilities that would allow them to carry out their missions by day and night while ensuring minimum civilian damage.⁹³
- Intra-Alliance politics made Operation Allied Force possible but also resulted in political and operational constraints that imposed limitations on warfare. The conditions of coalition warfare produced a relatively slow, deliberate air campaign, in contrast to the U.S. preference for high-tempo, continuous

⁹⁰ Frans Osinga, “European Defence: Does Anyone Really Care?” forthcoming in Fabien Terpan, ed., Europe As a Military Power, quoted with author’s permission.

⁹¹ Yost, 104.

⁹² Ibid., 103.

⁹³ RAND, “Operation Allied Force: Lessons for Future Coalition Operations,” 2001. Available at < <http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB72/>> (9 January 2003).

operations and overwhelming levels of force. The slower style of campaign was necessary to accommodate the consultative and deliberative functions of the coalition and to secure domestic and international popular support for the operation. Public support depended in large part on assurances that the risk of civilian casualties and damage was low. To minimize this risk, the Alliance limited the size, pace, targets, and amount of force used in the campaign.⁹⁴

- Despite years of multinational, cooperative planning within the Alliance, the allies found it difficult to agree on a common approach. The consensus for action was fragile in the absence of an immediate threat to allied territory or traditional interests. Disputes within the Alliance centered on three issues: whether a "gradualist" approach to the air war would succeed, whether the United States had the right to keep some sensitive information in U.S.-only channels, and whether ground forces should be introduced.⁹⁵
- Operation Allied Force highlighted some key differences in the perspectives of the United States and the European countries. The U.S. decision to maintain some information in U.S.-only channels occurred out of concern over the increased potential for information leaks in coalition operations. But many European countries resented the United States for what they considered to be overbearing control that excluded them from many decisions and minimized their involvement in others. In addition, many of the European allies were deeply uncomfortable with the legal basis of Operation Allied Force, which was carried out without the authorization of the United Nations or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).⁹⁶

Analyzing the implications of the Kosovo crisis, David Yost predicted that "[t]he tension between inclusiveness and effectiveness, a challenge to some degree for all international organizations, could become even more acute with regard to optional actions in support of collective security, in contrast with cases

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

clearly demanding collective defense – that is, acts of aggression directly threatening the security of one or more members of NATO.”⁹⁷

According to a report by the Defense Committee of the British House of Commons,

Some of our witnesses believe that the US experience in the Kosovo campaign and the need to conduct operations through consensus, resulting in what has been described as ‘war by committee’, had convinced the US military that the experience should not be repeated and that means other than NATO should be used in conducting future campaigns.⁹⁸

3. Coalition Dynamics and Operation Enduring Freedom

The U.S. imperative in regard to the campaign in Afghanistan had been, in the words of the Defense Committee of the British House of Commons, “to strike quickly and with force against terrorists in Afghanistan and... the reality of the situation was that it would have been difficult to get all 19 NATO countries to act within the four week period which the US was able to achieve.”⁹⁹ Tomas Valasek argues that

Excluding NATO from America’s fledgling war on terrorism does hold some advantages from the U.S. perspective. No longer does Washington need to seek the approval of all 19 allies for each and every step of the military campaign, as was the case in Kosovo. U.S. commanders need not worry whom to trust with key intelligence or who might leak it to the enemy.¹⁰⁰

The military phase of the campaign in Afghanistan, Operation Enduring Freedom, began on 7 October 2001 with cruise missile and air strikes on Taliban military installations and Al Qaida training camps. Britain was the only NATO ally

⁹⁷ David Yost, “NATO’s Contributions to Conflict Management,” in Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall, eds., Turbulent Peace: The Challenge of Managing International Conflict (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001), 585-602:599-600.

⁹⁸ House of Commons Defence Committee, The Future of NATO, Seventh Report of Session 2001-2002 (London: The Stationery Office Limited, 31 July 2002), 43.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 44.

¹⁰⁰ Tomas Valasek, “The Fight Against Terrorism: Where’s NATO?” World Policy Journal, Winter 2001/02, 19-25: 19.

that took part in the missile attacks and the air strikes at the beginning of the campaign. Another U.S. ally on the ground was the Northern Alliance. With U.S. air support and the assistance of small numbers of U.S. special forces, by 9 November 2001 the Northern Alliance captured the key city of Mazar-e-Sharif in Northern Afghanistan. On 14 November, the Northern Alliance entered the capital, Kabul. “Only after more than a month of fighting did the White House accept the allies’ offers of thousands of combat and support troops, and then only in limited numbers and outside NATO’s chain of command.”¹⁰¹

Perhaps the most surprising aspect of the current counterterrorist operations is that the world’s strongest military alliance, NATO, is nowhere in sight. The formerly 16, now 19, allies spent decades planning for jointly defending one another from an attack. Yet when the military operations began, the White House essentially asked NATO to stay out of the conflict, despite its offers of help and the gallant gesture of evoking the mutual defense clause in its founding document, the 1949 Washington Treaty, for the first time ever.¹⁰²

B. DECISIONS BY NATO AS A WHOLE

1. The Article 5 Invocation

Immediately after the terrorist attacks, in the evening of 11 September 2001, the NAC declared that “the United States can rely on its 18 Allies in North America and Europe for assistance and support.”¹⁰³ At that critical moment neither the U.S. government nor the NAC had reliable information about the origin of the attacks. The motives and the perpetrators were unclear; there was no claimed responsibility; and nobody set demands or conditions. The obvious facts were that three of the hijacked planes had completely demolished the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York and the west wing of the Pentagon in Washington, and had thereby caused thousands of deaths. The terrorist attacks were surprising and shocking; their enormity and barbarism were

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 19.

¹⁰² Ibid., 19.

¹⁰³ Statement by the North Atlantic Council, 11 September 2001, NATO Press Release (2001)122, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-122e.htm>> (21 December 2002).

sobering for all; and the success of the attacks against the strongest NATO member revealed the vulnerability of each state and its institutions.

However, some of the European allies have had a greater experience than the United States has had in tackling domestic terrorism, and they knew that no one is assured against terrorist attacks. The perception of vulnerability, the solidarity with the United States, and the anger and indignation at the brutal terrorist acts unified NATO allies and their partners in their resolve to support the United States in the response to the challenge of terrorism. The lack of information about the terrorists and their motives and identity led to the conditional invocation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty. The allies had to wait for the results from the investigation, which was to reveal whether the attacks were directed from abroad. This was set as a condition for the effective invocation of Article 5.

Article 5 defines the conditions upon which the principle of collective defense could be applied:

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.¹⁰⁴

The applicability of Article 5 to terrorist attacks against the United States requires additional analysis. Article 5, referring to Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, foresees the right of individual or collective self-defense in case

¹⁰⁴ "The North Atlantic Treaty," Article 5, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm>> (2 January 2003).

of an armed attack against one or more allies. The condition for effective application of Article 5 in response to the 11 September attacks was a confirmation to be presented to the NAC that the attacks were directed from outside the United States.

The case was complicated because the attacks were conducted within the United States with U.S. civilian aircraft. The hijackers used box-cutters to intimidate and neutralize the crews, and then directed the aircraft toward their designated targets. Could this be considered an armed attack against the United States?

If the civilian aircraft were used as powerful guided missiles against U.S. targets with the intention of causing a maximum of casualties, the answer is that this would be an armed attack against the United States. However, the aircraft were American; they did not come from abroad; they took off from U.S. airports.¹⁰⁵

The first official indication about the identity of the perpetrators of the 11 September attacks was presented to the NATO Secretary General and to the NAC by the Deputy Secretary of State of the United States, Richard Armitage, on 20 September 2001. This was the information necessary to effectively invoke Article 5. Despite Lord Robertson's reiteration of the Alliance's determination to contribute to the campaign in response to the terrorist attacks, the message of the Deputy Secretary of State was clear: "I didn't ... come here to ask for anything. I came here to share with good Allies the information we have."¹⁰⁶ U.S. statements and actions made it clear that the campaign would be conducted by a U.S.-led "coalition of the willing" – which also might be called a "coalition of the chosen" – and that NATO would not be expected to play a leading role in the forthcoming operation.

¹⁰⁵ It is out of the scope of this analysis to determine what applicability Article 5 might have if the hijackers were Americans but directed from abroad, or if the hijackers were foreigners but directed from within the United States by Americans.

¹⁰⁶ Press Availability: U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, 20 September 2001, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/s010920a.htm>> (2 January 2003).

Washington made it clear that the counterterrorist campaign will be led by the United States, not NATO. “If we need collective action, we’ll ask for it,” said U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense, Paul Wolfowitz. Campaign decisions are made in the Pentagon, not in Brussels.¹⁰⁷

However, the Alliance would have been put in a delicate situation if the invocation of Article 5 were not applied in practice. Most of the measures requested by the United States and adopted by the NAC on 4 October 2001 relate to the provision of support from individual allies. In other words, the United States could achieve a considerable part of the requested support on a bilateral basis: intelligence sharing, blanket overflight clearances, access to airfields and seaports, increased security for the U.S. facilities abroad, etc.

2. Collective Measures in Support of the Campaign Against Terrorism

The most significant collective measures, among the eight adopted by the NAC, are the deployment of seven NATO AWACS aircraft to the United States (Operation Eagle Assist) and the deployment of NATO Standing Naval Forces to the Eastern Mediterranean (Operation Active Endeavour). While the former operation had some practical applicability to the campaign against terrorism (relieving U.S. AWACS aircraft for participation in Operation Enduring Freedom), the latter operation has had a more symbolic character so far – “providing presence and demonstrating resolve,” according to official statements, as noted in Chapter II.

The eastern rim of the Mediterranean Sea is shaped by the coastlines of Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, and Libya. While two of these states are NATO members and two are participants in NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue, two other countries, Libya and Syria, are presented in the U.S. State Department’s *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001* as supporters of terrorism.¹⁰⁸ However, both Libya and Syria condemned the 11 September

¹⁰⁷ Valasek, 19.

¹⁰⁸ Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001, 63-68.

attacks and, in different ways, have recently tried to divest themselves of ties to terrorism.¹⁰⁹ Citizens of Egypt and Lebanon participated in the 11 September suicide terrorist attacks.

Sending naval vessels to the Eastern Mediterranean could be considered as a warning and expression of resolve against states sponsoring terrorism. However, the types of ships comprising Task Force Endeavour (TFE) are far removed from those designated to destroy land-based targets. The first STANAVFORMED group participating in Operation Active Endeavour consisted of seven frigates and one destroyer. The primary purpose of such ships is conducting maritime interception activities; and they are armed with ship-to-ship, ship-to-air, and anti-submarine weapons. For instance, the armaments of the frigate *HMS Chatham*, then flagship of STANAVFORMED, consists of

- one 114mm (4.5-inch) MK8 gun;
- one Goalkeeper close-in weapons system (CIWS);
- one Sea Wolf anti-missile system;
- two quad Harpoon anti-ship missile launchers;
- two 20mm close-range guns;
- two triple anti-submarine torpedo tubes;
- NATO Seagnat and DLF3 Decoy launchers; and
- two magazine launched anti-submarine torpedo tubes.¹¹⁰

The Greek guided missile destroyer HS *Formion* (the former USS *Joseph Strauss*) is armed with

- two 127mm (5-inch) MK42 guns;
- two triple MK32 torpedo launchers;
- one MK16 ASROC anti-submarine missile launcher; and
- one MK13 Mod.0 missile launcher for Standard and Harpoon anti-ship missiles.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 67-68.

¹¹⁰ "Royal Navy Ships: Type 22 Frigates," available at <<http://www.royal-navy.mod.uk/static/pages/447.html>> (7 March 2003).

It remains unclear what kinds of operations these ships would be able to perform against diverse international terrorist organizations. One of the TFE's tasks may be to present a deterrence posture so as to prevent possible terrorist attacks similar to that against the USS *Cole* in 2000. In practice, TFE has been engaged in monitoring the merchant vessels in the region. In conducting this task, TFE could possibly intercept ships illegally trafficking in weapons or immigrants. However, since the beginning of Operation Active Endeavour, no such results have been publicly reported.

STANAVFORMED and STANAVFORLANT have been the only elements of NATO's Immediate Reaction Forces (IRF) used in support of the U.S.-led campaign against terrorism. The structure of the IRF shows that NATO could hardly offer in the short term greater and more effective support relevant to the anti-terrorist campaign. In peacetime, the military forces that allies commit to Allied Command Europe (ACE) remain under national command. Under SACEUR's peacetime command are the ACE Mobile Force (Land), or the AMF(L), the NAEWF, STANAVFORMED, and most air defense and some communications units. The Reaction Forces (Air), or RF(A), have no permanent peacetime headquarters and elements subordinated to SACEUR. Nationally assigned units would be transferred under SACEUR's command when necessary.¹¹²

While the fundamental basis for the AMF remains, its roles and missions have been adapted to changes in the security environment. The AMF(L) mission is being adjusted to include peace support related operations... The AMF(L) today is one of the first military options within the crisis management system available to NATO and can be deployed by SACEUR on very short notice upon request of a nation and upon approval of NATO's Defence Planning Committee... When the full component of the AMF(L) is brought together, it becomes a balanced force made up of infantry

¹¹¹ "USS Joseph Strauss (DDG16)," available at <<http://navysite.de/dd/ddg/ddg16.htm>> (7 March 2003).

¹¹² "Allied Command Europe (ACE)," available at <<http://www.shape.nato.int/ace1.htm>> (7 March 2003).

battalions, artillery batteries and support units, with a fighting strength of a brigade group of about 5000 personnel. The AMF(L) primary role remains to demonstrate solidarity and resolve in support of peacetime deterrence...

The above paragraph makes it clear that SACEUR does not have in peacetime command over land forces deployable and sustainable far beyond the Alliance's area of responsibility, and able to conduct asymmetric warfare. In the words of two British experts,

Yet despite the invocation of Article 5, there are particular difficulties in using mechanisms of the alliance as a vehicle for military response. Political and intelligence assessments of extra-European developments have not been a priority within NATO. Expertise on the Islamic world and Middle Eastern and Central Asian states varies widely among the member states and interpretations of regional trends also differ... Few European allies – except for Britain and France – have the capability to project and support forces as far as the Persian Gulf, let alone further. The political symbolism of alliance solidarity in the wake of non-conventional attacks by non-state actors is not therefore translatable into common military action, beyond the area defined by the North Atlantic Treaty.¹¹³

However, on 6 December 2001, NATO stated that its “peacekeeping forces in the Balkans, with the support of countries of the region, have been acting to prevent terrorist groups from operating within and from the Balkans.”¹¹⁴

C. INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT OF THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORISM

1. Implications of the Operations in Afghanistan

In order to be effective, the fight against international terrorism demands international cooperation. Counterterrorism based on unilateralism can hardly

¹¹³ Anthony Foster and William Wallace, “What is NATO for?” *Survival*, vol.43, no. 4, Winter 2001. 107-122: 110.

¹¹⁴ “NATO's Response to Terrorism.” Statement issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 6 December 2001. NATO Press Release M-NAC-2 (2001)159, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-159e.htm>> (10 September 2002).

achieve significant results against diverse international terrorist networks. As Ian Lesser puts in,

The risks cross borders and may have global reach. As a result, it is difficult to imagine effective counterterrorism policies pursued on a national or unilateral basis. Again, the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon make this clear. The attacks left victims from over 80 countries. Suspects in the attacks have been arrested in some 80 states. Most of the planning for the 11 September attacks, and for Al Qaeda operations outside of the Middle East in general, appears to have taken place in Europe. So even from the point of view of American counterterrorism policy, understandably focused on "homeland defense," international cooperation is essential.¹¹⁵

The United States started building a large coalition immediately after 11 September. The initial aim of the coalition was to assist the United States in conducting the operation against the organizers of the terrorist attacks and their supporters, and to coordinate efforts to trace the international links and to apprehend suspected members of Al Qaida, rather than to employ coalition forces in the military campaign. As mentioned before, the first cruise missile attacks and air strikes were conducted mainly by the United States, supported only by the United Kingdom. One of the reasons for the British involvement in the first phase of Operation Enduring Freedom was that the United Kingdom was the European ally best equipped with functioning force projection capabilities at that time, including airlift, sealift, in-flight refueling, and precision-guided missiles. Another reason for British involvement probably resided in the long-standing close relations between London and Washington.

According to Martin Walker,

Britain instantly offered its unconditional support "until the end," took part in the first cruise missile and air strikes on Afghanistan on 7 October, and offered to commit its renowned SAS Special Forces, along with 4,200 other specialist troops and Royal Marines. This triggered a Dutch offer of their own marines, who now train alongside their British comrades. France offered reconnaissance aircraft and special forces. Italy and Spain offered their mountain

¹¹⁵ Ian Lesser, "Coalition Dynamics in the War against Terrorism," The International Spectator, 2/2002, 44.

troops, the Czechs offered their highly regarded chemical warfare detection and treatment units, and Germany offered whatever military assistance the United States might need.¹¹⁶

The Afghan Interim Authority took office on 22 December 2001. In order to provide support to the new government and to create conditions for the post-Taliban recovery of the country, on 20 December 2001 the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1386 to establish the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF).

International contributions to the U.S.-led military campaign in Afghanistan and to the UN-led ISAF have achieved significant dimensions. According to the U.S. Department of State, as of 14 June 2002, 69 nations had supported the campaign against terrorism, and 20 nations had deployed more than 16,000 troops to the U.S. Central Command's region of responsibility. The total number of non-Afghan forces in the country is about 15,000, of which 8,000 belong to U.S. coalition partners.¹¹⁷

In fulfillment of the eight measures for expanding the options in the campaign against terrorism, adopted by the NAC on 4 October 2001, the NATO allies provided, both individually and collectively, the following contributions:

- All 19 NATO Allies and the 9 NATO "aspirants" [without the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Slovenia] have provided blanket overflight rights, ports/bases access, refueling assistance, and increased law-enforcement cooperation...
- 16 Allies now support Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan and the global campaign against terrorism... 14 Allies have deployed forces in the region. 9 Allies are participating in combat operations.
- Allies and other partner countries have deployed nearly 4,000 troops to Afghanistan and also provide 95% of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), led first by the United Kingdom and now by Turkey.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Walker, 5.

¹¹⁷ U.S. Department of State Fact Sheet: "International Contributions to the War on Terrorism," available at <<http://www.state.gov/coalition/cr/fs/12753.htm>> (8 February 2003).

¹¹⁸ U.S. Department of State Fact Sheet: "NATO: Coalition Contributions to the War on Terrorism," available at <<http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/fs/14627.htm>> (6 February 2003).

Despite the fact that NATO has not played a leading role in the U.S.-led campaign against terrorism since 11 September 2001, one of its most important contributions has been common standards, procedures, planning, and training. It has also promoted force interoperability, so that the allies' forces can fight successfully alongside each other, even outside NATO's chain of command. In the words of Ian Lesser, "the Alliance played and continues to play a critical consensus-building role. The multinational operations in Afghanistan have clearly been facilitated by the planning capabilities and habits of cooperation developed by the Alliance."¹¹⁹

Regarding NATO's contributions to the campaign against terrorism, Lord Robertson stated on 14 June 2002:

NATO has... proved its value as a platform for coalition operations. The Allies are making contributions to the two continuing operations in Afghanistan... They are able to do so effectively only because of years of developing common procedures within the Alliance.¹²⁰

2. Post-11 September NATO-Russia Relations

Although on 11 September 2001 a new page in NATO-Russia relations was opened, the process of *rapprochement* started after the appointment of Vladimir Putin as Acting President of Russia on 31 December 1999. In March 2000, a meeting of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council was held with an agenda broader than peacekeeping in the Balkans. Since then, despite Western unease with Russia's operations in Chechnya, cooperation has become more intense.¹²¹ According to Martin Walker,

After September 11, despite the opposition of much of Russia's security establishment, including his old KGB colleague, Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov, Putin agreed to an unprecedented and far-reaching support of Bush's war on terrorism. He ordered Russian

¹¹⁹ Lesser, 44.

¹²⁰ Lord George Robertson, Speech at the Conference on "International Security and the Fight Against Terrorism," 14 June 2002, Vienna, Austria, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020614a.htm>> (3 March 2003).

¹²¹ Willem Matser, "Towards a New Strategic Partnership," *NATO Review*, vol. 49, no.4, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2001/0104-05.htm>> (8 October 2002).

Intelligence (FSB) to share information on the Taliban and opened Russian airspace to American logistics aircraft. He overruled the earlier statements of his military establishment to accept a U.S. military presence in Uzbekistan, and helped rearm and equip the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance.¹²²

Russian diplomacy seized the opportunity and undertook moves to put Russia and the Chechnya problem in the context of the campaign against terrorism. “[T]he al-Qaida network and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan had long been accused by Russia of aiding and radicalising rebel groups in Chechnya and fomenting instability along Russia’s southern rim. The notion of ‘common interests’ had never been clearer, on either side.”¹²³

Russia joined the anti-terrorist coalition and the allies welcomed this step. However, they have chosen to revise their stance toward the Chechen conflict. Apparently for the allies it might be more important to have Russia as a partner than to insist on supporting the various Chechen “freedom fighters.” At the NATO-Russia Conference on the Military Role in Combating Terrorism, Lord Robertson stated, “The terrorist threat is not new. Our Russian colleagues, who have seen the tragic loss of countless military and civilian lives at the hands of terrorists over the past decade, can bear witness to that.”¹²⁴

At the same event, the Russian Defense Minister, Sergei Ivanov, set forth Russia’s conditions for further cooperation in the struggle against terrorism: “If somebody still finds it beneficial to render ‘hearty welcome’ to representatives of the Chechen terrorist groups... then we state it firmly that all talking about our unity and solidarity may remain ‘empty words.’”¹²⁵

¹²² Walker, 8.

¹²³ Paul Fritch, “New Beginnings,” NATO Review (Summer 2002), available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue2/english/analysis.htm>> (8 October 2002).

¹²⁴ Lord George Robertson, “NATO-Russia Cooperation in Combating Terrorism: A Good Idea Whose Time Has Come”, Key note address at the NATO-Russia Conference on the Military Role in Combating Terrorism, NATO Defence College, Rome, Italy, 4 February 2002, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020204a.htm>> (3 March 2003).

¹²⁵ Sergei Ivanov, “Role of the Military in Combating Terrorism,” Introductory word by the Defence Minister of the Russian Federation at the NATO-Russia Conference on the Military Role in Combating Terrorism, NATO Defence College, Rome, Italy, 4 February 2002, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020204b.htm>> (3 March 2003).

Recently, the U.S. administration declared a shift in the U.S. position regarding Chechnya and terrorism. On 28 February 2003, the U.S. Secretary of State designated three Chechen organizations as terrorist groups in view of their direct involvement in the hostage-taking at Moscow's Dubrovka Theater in October 2002. However, the U.S. government stated clearly that it does not consider all Chechen fighters terrorists.¹²⁶

Since October 2001, NATO and Russia have launched several initiatives related to the common struggle against terrorism. Some of these initiatives include "regular exchange of information and in-depth consultation on issues relating to terrorist threats, the prevention of the use by terrorists of ballistic missile technology and nuclear, biological and chemical agents, civil emergency planning, and the exploration of the role of the military in combating terrorism."¹²⁷

On 28 May 2002, the NATO-Russia PJC was replaced by the NATO-Russia Council (NRC), which enables Russia to participate in discussions as an equal partner, as one among twenty ("at 20" instead of "19+1"). Nevertheless, Russia will not have a right to veto NATO's decisions. The NRC will focus its efforts on the following areas: terrorism, crisis management, non-proliferation, arms control, theatre missile defense, civil emergencies, military cooperation and defense reform, new threats and challenges, and search and rescue at sea.¹²⁸

In June 2002, Lord Robertson outlined the importance of the NATO-Russia partnership as follows:

Countering terrorism is at the heart of NATO's new relationship with Russia... We need Russia to face new and common threats, just as

¹²⁶ U.S. Department of State, "Three Chechen Groups Designated as Terrorists," 28 February 2003, available at <<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/03022804.htm>> (8 March 2003).

¹²⁷ Press Statement on NATO-Russia Co-Operation in Combating Terrorism, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p020128e.htm>> (3 March 2003).

¹²⁸ House of Commons..., 36.

much as Russia needs us. Russia is now willing to play an honest, cooperative role in working with us.¹²⁹

This chapter has analyzed the role that NATO has played in the post-11 September campaign against terrorism. After 11 September, the United States decided to lead a “coalition of the willing” rather than to transfer the initiative to the Alliance. Several factors influenced that decision, including the need for speed and effectiveness in the campaign in Afghanistan, the lessons learned from the NATO-led Operation Allied Force in the Kosovo conflict, and the military capabilities gap between the United States and its allies.

The military role that NATO has had in the campaign against terrorism has been mainly supportive, but the experience that the allies have gained as a result of their common work for decades within the Alliance provides them with a solid basis for effectively participating in military operations outside NATO’s chain of command. As Philip Gordon of the Brookings Institution has noted,

While NATO’s formal military role was necessarily very limited in the first weeks of the military campaign, the alliance’s political solidarity was highly significant, as is the military interoperability that will allow some allies to participate in later stages of the campaign.¹³⁰

The terrorist attacks against the United States on 11 September 2001 also gave a new impetus to NATO-Russia relations. The cooperation in countering terrorism has proven to be of importance to both parties.

¹²⁹ Lord George Robertson, “Tackling Terror: NATO’s New Mission,” Speech at the American Enterprise Institute’s New Initiative, 20 June 2002, Washington, D.C., available at <<http://nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020620a.htm>> (22 November 2002).

¹³⁰ Phillip Gordon. “NATO After 11 September.” *Survival*, vol.43, no. 4, Winter 2001. 89-106: 89.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents the findings of the analysis of NATO's participation in responding to the 11 September attacks. This includes implications about the future role of the Alliance in combating international terrorism, based on the characteristics of the asymmetric conflicts, on the possible role of the military in combating terrorism and on NATO's current role in the campaign against terrorism. It appears that currently NATO can play only a limited and mainly supportive role in fighting terrorism, while the larger responsibilities continue to remain on the shoulders of national governments. The new threats to international security require the Alliance to adapt to meet the challenges of the 21st century. As during previous periods of transition, the Alliance will need to redefine its roles and missions and to develop appropriate capabilities to deal with the new threats.

A. TERRORISM AS AN ASYMMETRIC THREAT

In the words of Thérèse Delpech, after the 11 September terrorist attacks,

something different, something unrecognizable, something irreconcilable with concepts inherited from past experiences of either war or terrorism has come into being. This new phenomenon, however, does have a name: asymmetric warfare... Such an extraordinary attack, in real time and real space, gave asymmetry a horrific shape.¹³¹

Symmetric warfare is characterized by similar military capabilities in the hands of opponents of comparable strength. The outcome of such warfare depends on superiority in tactics, sustainability, training, armaments, logistics, national resources, etc. Asymmetric warfare is characterized by significant differences in the military capabilities and tactics of the belligerents, and the outcome may be determined by an ability to exploit the opponent's weaknesses.

[T]he United States found itself contemplating exactly the opposite of the sort of war it wanted to fight, against an enemy able to find

¹³¹ Thérèse Delpech, "The Imbalance of Terror," *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 25 (Winter 2002), 31-40: 32. Available at <<http://www.twq.com/02winter/delpech.pdf>> (9 January 2003).

sanctuary by merging into a mountainous and inaccessible terrain for defensive purposes and possessing the ability to merge with global civil society to mount attacks against enemy assets, including in its homeland. The extremity of its weakness in conventional military terms is matched by the extremity of its dependence on terrorism.¹³²

Delpech analyzes the 11 September attacks by highlighting major differences between a superpower state and a terrorist organization. She describes the terrorist tactics that were successful on 11 September as follows:

- Have no center and strike at the heart of the superpower.
- The United States wants life at any cost? Kill as many civilians as possible.
- Reveal U.S. vulnerability to rustic means of war.
- Fight the kind of war the United States hates: an elusive enemy who uses guerrilla tactics.
- The United States makes military plans years ahead, so surprise them continuously.
- Because the United States worries about collateral damage, fight unrestricted and total war.
- The United States places a premium on transparency, so act like a secret sect.¹³³

Ivan Arreguín-Toft argues that in asymmetric conflict, in which the stronger opponent is attacking and the weaker one is defending, the strong opponent will only have a chance for success if it applies a combat strategy analogous to that of the weak actor (e.g. direct attack versus direct defense, or indirect attack versus indirect defense). Otherwise, different strategies would help the weak opponent defeat the attacker.¹³⁴

For this reason, counterterrorism forces should be prepared to conduct both conventional and unconventional warfare. While the law-enforcement

¹³² Lawrence Freedman, "The Third World War?" *Survival*, vol. 43, no.4 (Winter 2001), 61-87: 66.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 32-34.

¹³⁴ Ivan Arreguín-Toft, "How the Weak Win Wars," *International Security*, vol. 26, no.1 (Summer 2001), 93-128: 107-109.

agencies bear the primary responsibilities for dealing with internal terrorist threats and the external intelligence agencies might be used to support covert operations abroad to neutralize terrorist leaders, the role of the military in combating terrorism remains limited.

B. THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN COMBATING TERRORISM

The applicability of military force in anti-terrorist operations has two dimensions: internal and external. The use of military forces for internal security purposes is a central issue for democratic civil-military relations.

The diapason of concepts for military involvement varies from a fully militarized response to military support to the civil authorities (MSCA). In the first case, “the armed forces can contribute the firepower, force projection capability and expertise, such as hostage rescue commandos, sophisticated bomb disposal teams and specialist marksmen which the civilian police is unable to provide.”¹³⁵ Under MSCA, “the military’s role is strictly limited to support the police and civil authorities, and the army... can be held accountable for its actions under the criminal and civil laws.”¹³⁶ Moreover, according to Paul Wilkinson,

A fully militarized response implies the complete suspension of the civilian legal system and its replacement by martial law, summary punishments, the imposition of curfews, military censorship and extensive infringements of normal civil liberties in the name of exigencies of war. By adopting a totally militarized response the government inevitably finds it has removed all the constraints of legal accountability and minimum force, enabling the military commanders to deploy massively lethal and destructive firepower in the name of suppressing terrorism.¹³⁷

Some states (Germany, for example) have adopted more restrictive laws limiting to a maximum extent the options for such internal military deployments, while others (such as Canada, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States) foresee broader options for using the specific

¹³⁵ Paul Wilkinson, Terrorism Versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response (London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2001), 126.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 102.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 103.

skills of the military in crisis responses, including counterterrorism.¹³⁸ In the United Kingdom, for instance, in the case of an internal threat to national sovereignty, “it would be legitimate to deploy force in support of the civil authority, as for example in counterterrorism.”¹³⁹ According to Boëne and Martin, who analyzed the role of the French military,

It was recognized... that the more serious threats in the new environment might be not military in the pre-1990 definition of the term. Destabilization of the country from within is now a clear and present danger. Although many have come to doubt the armed forces’ relevance to risks such as terrorism, uncontrolled immigration, drug trafficking, internal violence spilling from immigrant “no-go areas,” or the internationalization of organized crime, the [French government’s] DWP [Defense White Paper] emphasized the need for closer links between internal and external security; such connections would imply new, still unspecified roles for the military.¹⁴⁰

However, Paul Wilkinson expresses some reasonable concerns about the internal, law-enforcement roles of the military in democratic states:

Even in well-established democratic political systems, there are some major risks involved in deploying the military abroad or on their own territory for the purposes of combating international organized crime. The military are trained to fight external foes and to use maximum force. The police, on the other hand, are trained to use minimum force, and, if possible, to bring suspects to trial, following criminal investigation. The military have generally been trained and equipped, at considerable expense, to carry out the important and difficult duties of external defence... Last, but not least, there is a great danger that, once having committed the military, the government will be unable or unwilling to withdraw them, thus making the community and the police increasingly dependent on the military presence.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ For detailed information about the contemporary roles of the military in these countries, refer to Charles Moskos, John Allen Williams, and David R. Segal (ed.) The Postmodern Military, (New York, N.Y. and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

¹³⁹ Christopher Dandeker, “The United Kingdom: The Overstretched Military,” in Moskos, Williams, and Segal, 32.

¹⁴⁰ Bernard Boëne and Michel Louis Martin, “France: In the Throes of Epoch-Making Change,” in Moskos, Williams, and Segal, 54.

¹⁴¹ Wilkinson, 134.

Consolidated democracies offer different examples of defining the role of the military, but it is a common wisdom that “governments should only employ troops for internal security purposes with the very greatest reluctance, and... if they are compelled to deploy them they should seek to withdraw them at the earliest opportunity.”¹⁴² Wilkinson presents a few reasons to support the principle of limiting use of the military for internal security purposes:

- [I]t may be assumed that the belligerent faction or factions enjoy at least some support or sympathy in sections of the general population. Hence, an unnecessary high military profile may merely serve to escalate the level of violence by polarizing pro- and anti-government elements in the community.¹⁴³
- [I]nternal security duties under the strict limits imposed in a constitutionalist liberal democratic system conflict fundamentally in many respects with the professional instincts, traditions and ethos of the military.¹⁴⁴
- There is a constant risk that a repressive overreaction or a minor error of judgment by the military may trigger further civil violence.
- [T]he civil power may become over-dependent upon the army’s presence, and there may be a consequent lack of urgency in preparing the civil police for gradually resuming the internal security responsibility.¹⁴⁵
- [P]rolonged internal security duties absorb considerable manpower and involve diverting highly trained military technicians from their vital external defense role.¹⁴⁶

Regarding the “external” role of the military in combating terrorism, Wilkinson discusses some advantages of offensive operations and retaliatory strikes conducted by a “major power sorely provoked by terrorism”¹⁴⁷ against terrorist groups and their sponsor states:

¹⁴² Ibid., 103.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 126.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 126.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 126.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 126.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 128.

- It answers inevitable public and media demands for tough action against sponsors/perpetrators.
- By inflicting heavy costs on the terrorists and/or their sponsors, it offers a chance of deterring further attacks and sponsorships.
- It offers a possibility of converting the deterrence message to a wider range of potential attackers/state sponsors internationally.
- It offers a possibility of inflicting a psychologically damaging blow at the enemy leadership which might undermine them or hasten their removal from power.¹⁴⁸

However, Wilkinson also considers some “grave difficulties” in undertaking such operations:

- In many cases of terrorist attack it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain sufficient high-quality intelligence to determine with certainty the identity of the perpetrator responsible for the attack.
- A military attack/reprisal could provoke a wider conflict in which the advantages of the originally conceived counter-terrorist blow are outweighed by much wider costs.
- A reprisal which causes the death of innocent civilians carries the risk of losing the ‘moral high ground’ and the sympathy of international opinion.
- A military reprisal which is taken unilaterally may not carry the support of important allies and may cause added stress and strains on alliances.
- A military reprisal may arouse false expectations among the general public of success in defeating terrorism, and lead to expectations of similar or intensified military action next time.¹⁴⁹

In countering international terrorism domestically, the democratic state cannot avoid the dilemmas associated with reconciling effective counterterrorist measures with civil rights protection, the democratic process, and the rule of law. On the one hand, the government must avoid any significant overreaction, which might provoke social tensions caused by restricted civil rights. On the other

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 128.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 129.

hand, ineffective counterterrorist measures might undermine the credibility and authority of the government. In order to maintain this balance, in countering terrorism the state should rely primarily on its criminal justice and law-enforcement institutions. However, when heavily armed terrorist groups enjoy safe havens provided by foreign states, military interventions conducted by appropriate forces may be necessary.¹⁵⁰

C. NATO'S POSSIBLE FUTURE ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Philip Gordon considers that the campaign against terrorism “will have significant impact on practically every aspect of NATO and the context in which it operates – the future of transatlantic solidarity, alliance military structures, enlargement, NATO-Russia relations, the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), and NATO’s future organisation, roles and missions.”¹⁵¹ Arguably, all these areas have proved to be of significant importance for the Alliance and the need for adjustments has become noticeable.

Transatlantic solidarity was undoubtedly demonstrated after 11 September by invoking Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and by providing individual and collective support to the U.S.-led campaign against terrorism. However, the U.S. decision to reject the option of a NATO-led operation has provoked discussions and debates about NATO’s future as a military Alliance and as an effective tool in combating terrorism. The U.S. government’s decision to organize a U.S.-led anti-terrorist campaign was probably influenced by the lessons learned in Washington from the NATO-led Kosovo air campaign and by the existing (and growing) transatlantic capabilities gap.

NATO’s existing collective military capabilities, including the Immediate Reaction Forces, could not be used directly in Operation Enduring Freedom. However, the Standing Naval Forces Mediterranean, the Standing Naval Forces

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 214.

¹⁵¹ Phillip Gordon, “NATO After 11 September.” *Survival*, vol.43, no. 4, Winter 2001. 89-106: 89.

Atlantic, the NATO Airborne Early Warning Force, the Kosovo Force, and the Stabilization Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina supported the efforts of the anti-terrorist coalition. NATO's force structure requires adjustment to the new challenges. In this regard, the allies decided to create the NATO Response Force at the Prague Summit in November 2002. This force, which is to be fully operational no later than October 2006, could be an effective tool both for the collective defense needs of the allies and for rapid deployments within and beyond NATO's region, including responses to terrorist threats or attacks. This force could also be used for implementing and enforcing decisions of the United Nations Security Council.

Inviting seven more East European countries to join the Alliance in 2004 could be considered not only as expanding NATO's zone of influence and increasing the level of security in the region, but also as embracing these states in the Euro-Atlantic security environment and preventing some of them from becoming a source of instability in the future. The invitations demonstrated the Alliance's confidence in these countries. The Alliance now expects adequate responses from them, related both to improving their military capabilities and interoperability and generating stability in the region. Almost all of the invited countries have contributed to the campaign against terrorism in accordance with their current capabilities.

Relations between NATO and Russia also received a new impetus after 11 September. Russia, which has internal terrorism problems, contributes significantly to the broad anti-terrorist campaign. The new NATO-Russia Council is expected to be a forum for further enhancing cooperation and for coordination of common activities in several important areas, including counterterrorism.

The campaign against terrorism will have at least two implications for the EU's ESDP. First, in order to have sufficient manpower for the anti-terrorist operations, the United States would probably need to withdraw some of its troops from the Balkans. This would require the EU members to be prepared to deploy their forces earlier than they had expected. Second, the European allies are

expected to significantly improve their military capabilities, especially those related to force projection, high-intensity combat, and improved interoperability with the U.S forces.¹⁵²

In a series of statements, NATO clarified the definition of its future roles and missions regarding the fight against terrorism. On 6 December 2001, the NAC reiterated the Alliance's determination to play an active role in this struggle. In this statement the NAC envisaged some important practical measures related to NATO's future roles and missions for combating terrorism:

Disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation can make an essential contribution to the fight against terrorism. We will enhance our ability to provide support, when requested, to national authorities for the protection of civilian populations against the effects of any terrorist attack... We reaffirm our willingness to provide assistance, individually or collectively, as appropriate and according to our capabilities, to Allies and other states which are or may be subject to increased terrorist threats as a result of their support for the campaign against terrorism.¹⁵³

On 18 December 2001, NATO declared its resolve to adapt its capabilities to the new challenges to international security. However, in this statement the allies did not assign the military the primary role among the other possible means of countering terrorism:

[W]e are especially concerned to ensure that the Alliance military concepts evolve in keeping with our clear appreciation of the menace posed by terrorism. Such action must of course make use of a wide range of national and international means, of which military ones are only a part.¹⁵⁴

On 31 January 2002, in response to critics who argued that NATO has no role in dealing with the new threats, Lord Robertson stated that "the Alliance is

¹⁵² Ibid., 98-99.

¹⁵³ "NATO's Response to Terrorism." Statement issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 6 December 2001. NATO Press Release M-NAC-2 (2001)159, par. 6-7, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-159e.htm>> (10 September 2002).

¹⁵⁴ "Statement on Combating Terrorism: Adapting the Alliance's Defence Capabilities," NATO Press Release (2001)173, 18 December 2001, par.2, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-173e.htm>> (10 September 2002).

becoming the primary means for developing the role of the armed forces to defeat the terrorist threat.”¹⁵⁵ This does not mean that the Alliance will become a primary tool for combating terrorism. It means, however, that NATO will provide coordination and a framework for appropriate training of the armed forces for possible anti-terrorist tasks.

On 14 June 2002, Lord Robertson declared some “fundamentally important decisions”¹⁵⁶ made by the NAC that outline the areas in which NATO can contribute most effectively to the fight against terrorism:

NATO should be ready to help deter, defend, disrupt and protect against terrorist attacks, or threat of attacks, directed from abroad against our populations, territory, infrastructure and forces, including by acting against these terrorists and those who harbour them. Similarly, if requested, we should be ready to provide assistance to national authorities in dealing with the consequences of terrorist attacks, particularly where these involve chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons. We agreed that NATO should be ready to deploy its forces ‘as and where required’ to carry out such missions. And we agreed that, following a case-by-case decision, NATO might provide its assets and capabilities to support operations undertaken by or in cooperation with the EU or other international organisations or coalitions involving Allies.¹⁵⁷

The NAC also specified the need to develop four critical military capabilities: “secure, modern communications and information systems; the ability to move forces quickly to where they are needed, and to stay there as long as necessary; the means to work together seamlessly, and to win in combat; and last but certainly not least, defences against chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear attacks.”¹⁵⁸ Developing these capabilities will improve the

¹⁵⁵ Lord George Robertson, “NATO After September 11,” Speech by Lord Robertson, Secretary General of NATO, to the Pilgrims of the United States, New York, 31 January 2001, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020131a.htm>> (3 January 2003).

¹⁵⁶ Lord George Robertson, Speech by NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson at the conference on “International Security and the Fight Against Terrorism”, Vienna, Austria, 14 June 2002, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020614a.htm>> (3 January 2003).

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ “Tackling Terror: NATO's New Mission.” Speech by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson at The American Enterprise Institute on 20 June 2002, available at <<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020620a.htm>> (22 November 2002).

interoperability between the NATO members and will contribute to diminishing the military capabilities gap between the United States and the European allies.

However, some analysts have expressed reasonable concerns about significantly broadening NATO's roles in combating terrorism:

The formulation of a broad response to the challenges posed by transnational terrorism is beyond NATO's capabilities or its appropriate functions. The EU and G-8 have developed an extensive network of inter-agency cooperation in combating transnational crime and subversive organizations; it makes more sense to build on that than to extend NATO into an 'anti-terrorist alliance', as some have suggested in the wake of the attacks on New York and Washington.¹⁵⁹

The analysis of NATO's current participation in the campaign against terrorism and the assessment of the appropriate role of the military in combating terrorism and winning asymmetric conflicts suggest key findings about the future possible role of the Alliance in the struggle against international terrorism.

First, NATO has historically concentrated on defense capabilities relevant to its main goal – assuring peace and security in Europe. Most of the European allies do not have significant force projection capabilities and must rely on U.S. assets. The new threats require new responses, including new force structures and new capabilities. However, the new responses also call for new strategies, tactics, priorities, training, and resources.

Second, NATO has developed several mechanisms for reducing the threats posed by the huge stockpiles of small armaments and light weapons in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet republics. It also has politico-military tools for reducing the risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) through active cooperation with its partners in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Third, the winning strategy for the strong actor in asymmetric conflict, at least in some circumstances, is to apply the same approach as the weak one. In

¹⁵⁹ Anthony Foster and William Wallace, "What is NATO for?" *Survival*, vol.43, no. 4, Winter 2001. 107-122: 118.

the case of combating terrorist cells this might mean covert operations, low-intensity conflicts, surprise raids, and other unconventional methods. NATO forces do not fully meet the requirements for conducting such operations and therefore need additional preparation and equipment.

Fourth, the law-enforcement and intelligence agencies have the main responsibility for countering internal threats posed by domestic and/or international terrorist organizations. In principle, the military should be used only as the last possible option for restoring public order, or as a military support to the civil authorities – for preventing terrorist attacks and/or for dealing with the consequences of possible terrorist attacks, including attacks conducted with WMD.

NATO has to adapt itself to the new international security environment; otherwise it may become a regional political-military organization with some peacekeeping functions. Currently the military capabilities of most of the allies do not allow them to rapidly deploy forces far beyond NATO's borders. The forces and assets which the allies are ready to contribute are much more prepared to participate in peace support operations than in high-intensity combat or long-range power projection. The fact that the United States allotted the Alliance a secondary, supportive role during the initial phases of the post-11 September campaign against terrorism has led the allies to redefine NATO's future role in countering international terrorism. NATO has a future role in the struggle against international terrorism, but it must also continue to support the significant non-military efforts to neutralize the terrorist threats.

APPENDIX A – THE NATO AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING & CONTROL FORCE¹⁶⁰

In the early 1970s, studies directed by NATO's major military commanders showed that an airborne early warning (AEW) radar system would significantly enhance the Alliance's air defense capability. In December 1978, the Defense Planning Committee signed a Memorandum of Understanding to buy and operate a NATO-owned AEW system. With this decision the member nations embarked on NATO's largest commonly funded acquisition program.

The NATO Airborne Early Warning & Control (NAEW&C) Force was established in January 1980 and granted full NATO Command Headquarters status by NATO's Defense Planning Committee on 17 October 1980. The Force Command Headquarters is located with Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) in Mons, Belgium. While the NAEW&C Force supports two major NATO commands – Allied Command Atlantic (ACLANT) and Allied Command Europe (ACE) – SHAPE exercises administrative control of the force.

The NAEW&CF mixed force consists of two operational elements (Components): the NATO E-3A Component at Geilenkirchen, Germany, with 17 Boeing NATO E-3A aircraft and a second component, No. 8 (Airborne Early Warning) Squadron of the British Royal Air Force (RAF) at Waddington, United Kingdom, with 7 Boeing E-3D aircraft. The E-3D Component declared its Initial Operating Capability on 1 July 1992, bringing the NAEW Mixed Force Concept to reality.

The NATO E-3A Component is represented by 12 nations (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United States). The E-3As have been operating from the Main Operating Base (MOB) at Geilenkirchen, Germany, since February 1982. Forward Operating Bases (FOBs) are located at Trapani, Italy; Aktion, Greece; Konya, Turkey; and a Forward Operating Location (FOL) at Oerland, Norway.

The E-3D Component, No.8 (AEW) Squadron of the RAF, is manned only by RAF personnel and its Main Operating Base (MOB) is RAF Waddington in Lincolnshire, United Kingdom.

When operating at an altitude of about 30,000 feet, an E-3A aircraft can continuously scan more than 312,000 km² of the earth's surface. Operating well within Western airspace, such aircraft can provide early warning about low-flying

¹⁶⁰ NATO Airborne Early Warning & Control Force Fact Sheet, available at <<http://www.nato.int/terrorism/fs-awacs.pdf>> (15 February 2003).

intruders into the NATO area as well as high altitude coverage extending deep into the territory of a potential aggressor. While the Force's principal role is air surveillance, it provides economical communications support for air operations, including counter-air, close air support, rescue, reconnaissance and airlift as well as surveillance and control. Aircrews can exchange information with ground- and sea-based commanders since the E-3As/E-3Ds can use maritime mode radar to detect and monitor enemy shipping.

The AEW radar is able to "look down" and separate moving targets from the stationary ground clutter that confuses other radar. It adds the ability to detect and track enemy aircraft operating at low altitudes over all terrain and to identify and give directions to friendly aircraft operating in the same area. In addition, the E-3A's mobility allows it to be deployed rapidly where it is most needed and makes it far less vulnerable to attack than ground-based radars.

APPENDIX B – STANDING NAVAL FORCE MEDITERRANEAN¹⁶¹

NATO's Standing Naval Force Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED) was activated on 30 April 1992, when eight Allied naval units started flying the NATO flag in Naples, Italy. STANAVFORMED provides a continuous maritime presence and thus is a constant and visible reminder of the solidarity and cohesiveness of the Alliance. The inauguration of this long-awaited NATO naval force marked an important step in the process initiated with the approval of the new NATO Strategic Concept, which calls for a greater role to be played by allied multinational forces.

As the natural successor to the NATO Naval On-Call Force Mediterranean (NAVOCFORMED) –which had been periodically activated for more than 20 years – STANAVFORMED is a naval force made up of vessels from various allied nations, training and operating together as a collective whole under the Commander, Allied Naval Forces Southern Europe (COMNAVSOUTH), currently Vice Admiral Ferdinando Sanfelice di Monteforte.

Nations normally contributing to the Force are Germany, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom and United States. Other NATO nations have also occasionally contributed. Composition of the Force varies.

Command of the force rotates among participating countries. The present commander is Commodore Philip Wirth, Royal Netherlands Navy, who took command on 13 September 2002.

¹⁶¹ Standing Naval Force Mediterranean Fact Sheet, available at <<http://www.afsouth.nato.int/factsheets/STANAVFORMED.htm>> (15 February 2003).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX C – STANDING NAVAL FORCE ATLANTIC¹⁶²

The Standing Naval Force is a squadron of eight to ten destroyers and frigates. Today, the ships are usually attached to the force for up to six months on a rotating basis. Units of one nationality do not necessarily relieve units from the same nation. To provide continuity, the force commander and his staff are appointed on a more permanent basis, with the post of force commander rotating annually among the participating countries.

The tours of duty for his multinational staff are for one year. The Chief Staff Officer, Operations Officer, Anti-Submarine Warfare Officer, Above Water Warfare Officer and Communications Officer are from nations other than the commander's while the staff public affairs officer is from the Commander's nation. These positions rotate over the year to maintain a balance of representation among member nations.

In peacetime, the force exercises primarily in the Eastern Atlantic – the most probable area of operation. Thus, Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic (SACLANT) has operational command of the force, and the Commander-in-Chief East Atlantic administers the force on SACLANT's behalf. SACLANT routinely delegates operational control to the area commander where the force is operating.

In terms of specific and continuing tasks, STANAVFORLANT spends about 60% of its time under way, conducting squadron training exercises, cooperating with non-STANAVFORLANT national forces to make the optimum use of available training and support facilities. In the course of this work, the force participates in major NATO and national exercises at sea and plays an important part in the evolution of new NATO naval warfare tactics. Also, the force is scheduled to visit various ports, including those of non- NATO countries, to show itself as a visible symbol of naval solidarity. Through its various social, sporting and community activities during in-port periods STANAVFORLANT demonstrates the intangible qualities inherent in multinational co-operation.

Despite the fact that its ships have different capabilities and national roles, its officers and crewmembers come from different nations, speak many different languages, and follow a variety of customs, STANAVFORLANT has developed into an effective integrated squadron with an identity of its own, at sea and ashore. The fact that all the ships fly the NATO flag and all the members of each ship's company wear the STANAVFORLANT badge on their uniforms contributes to a sense of belonging.

¹⁶² Standing Naval Force Atlantic Fact Sheet, available at <http://www.eastlant.nato.int/snfl/snfl.htm> (15 February 2003).

Any alliance is subject to internal and external strains, but nearly all who have been closely connected with STANAVFORLANT see it as a highly effective force and nucleus of NATO maritime power. Its continuous presence demonstrates the solidarity and vigilance of the NATO Alliance while constantly developing multinational maritime skills and tactics.

APPENDIX D – OPERATION ACTIVE ENDEAVOUR: PARTICIPATING FORCES¹⁶³

STANAVFORMED (6 October – 07 December 2001)

1. HMS *Chatham*, frigate, United Kingdom, (flagship)
2. FGS *Bayern*, frigate, Germany
3. HS *Formion*, destroyer, Greece
4. ITS *Aliseo*, frigate, Italy
5. HNLMS *Van Nes*, frigate, The Netherlands
6. SPS *Santa Maria*, frigate, Spain
7. TCG *Giresun*, frigate, Turkey
8. USS *Elrod*, frigate, United States

STANAVFORLANT (7 December 2001 – 13 January 2002)

1. NRP *Corte Real*, frigate, Portugal (flagship)
2. BNS *Wesdiep*, frigate, Belgium
3. HDMS *Niels Juel*, frigate, Denmark
4. FGS *Karlsruhe*, destroyer, Germany
5. ITS *Audace*, destroyer, Italy
6. HNLMS *Heemskerck*, frigate, The Netherlands
7. HNMLS *Amsterdam*, oiler, The Netherlands
8. HNOMS *Narvik*, frigate, Norway
9. SPS *Extremadura*, frigate, Spain
10. HMS *Exeter*, destroyer, United Kingdom
11. USS *Elrod*, frigate, United States

STANAVFORMED (14 January - 14 April 2002)

1. HMS *Chatham*, frigate, United Kingdom (Flagship) (14 January - 16 February 2002)
2. HMS *Sheffield*, frigate, United Kingdom (Flagship) (from 16 February 2002)
3. USS *Elrod*, frigate, United States (until 4 March 2002).
4. FGS *Luebeck*, frigate, Germany
5. HS *Salamis*, frigate, Greece
6. SPS *Baleares*, frigate, Spain
7. ITS *Grecale*, frigate, Italy
8. TCG *Gokceada*, frigate, Turkey

¹⁶³ Source: "Participating Forces of Operation Active Endeavour", available at <<http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/Endeavour/forces.htm>> (15 February 2003).

9. HNLMS *Witte de With*, frigate, The Netherlands
10. ITS *Artigliere*, frigate, Italy (from 15 Feb 2002)
11. HNOMS *Uthaug*, submarine, Norway
12. ITS *Minerva*, frigate, Italy (25 February-13 March 2002)

STANAVFORLANT (15 April – 8 July 2002)

1. SPS *Canarias*, frigate, Spain (Flagship)
2. HMS *Norfolk*, frigate, United Kingdom
3. FGS *Luetjens*, destroyer, Germany
4. HNOMS *Narvik*, frigate, Norway
5. NRP *Vasco da Gama*, frigate, Portugal
6. HDMS *Olfert-Fisher*, frigate, Denmark
7. USS *Samuel B Roberts*, frigate, United States
8. HNMLS *Amsterdam*, tanker, The Netherlands

In addition to STANAVFORLANT, the following units [operated] within Task Force Endeavour:

9. ITS *Granatiere*, frigate, Italy
10. HNOMS *Uthaug*, submarine, Norway (until 1 June 2002).

STANAVFORMED (9 July 2002 - 16 October 2002)

1. HMS *Chatham*, frigate, United Kingdom (Flagship) (13 August - 13 September 2002)
2. HNLMS *Witte de With*, frigate, The Netherlands (Flagship) (from 13 September 2002)
3. USS *Arthur Wradford*, frigate, United States (from 1 September 2002)
4. FGS *Moelders*, destroyer, Germany
5. HS *Aegean*, frigate, Greece (from 20 August 2002)
6. SPS *Asturias*, frigate, Spain (from 1 September 2002)
7. ITS *Perseo*, frigate, Italy (until 9 September 02)
8. ITS *Granatiere*, frigate, Italy (from 10 September 2002)
9. TCG *Gaziantep*, frigate, Turkey (until 10 September 2002)
10. TCG *Gediz*, frigate, Turkey (from 11 September 2002)
11. HMS *Edinburgh*, destroyer, United Kingdom (from 13 September 2002)
12. HMS *Sheffield*, frigate, United Kingdom (Flagship) (9 July - 13 August 2002)
13. HS *Limnos*, frigate, Greece (until 19 Aug 02)
14. USS *Taylor*, frigate, United States (until 31 Aug 02)
15. SPS *Andalucia*, frigate, Spain (until 31 Aug 02)

STANAVFORLANT (17 October - 7 December 2002)

1. SPS *Numancia*, frigate, Spain (Flagship)

2. HMS *Somerset*, frigate, United Kingdom
3. USS *De Wert*, frigate, United States
4. HNOMS *Trondheim*, frigate, Norway
5. ITS *Artigliere*, frigate, Italy

[A]dditional national contributions to TFE:

6. HDMS *Saelen*, submarine, Denmark
7. TCG *Trakya*, frigate, Turkey
8. HS *Navarinon*, frigate, Greece
9. TCG *Bozcaada*, frigate, Turkey
10. HS *Kavaloydis*, patrol boat, Greece
11. HS *Vlachavas*, patrol boat, Greece

STANAVFORMED (8 December 2002 -)

1. HNLMS *Abraham van der Hulst*, frigate, The Netherlands (Flagship)
2. HS *Navarinon*, frigate, Greece
3. HS *Vlahavas*, patrol boat, Greece
4. TCG *Bartin*, corvette, Turkey
5. USS *Hawes*, frigate, United States
6. HS *Elli*, frigate, Greece
7. SPS *Asturias*, frigate, Spain
8. TCG *Gelibolu*, frigate, Turkey
9. ITS *Scirocco*, frigate, Italy
10. FGS *Augsburg*, frigate, Germany
11. TCG *Ege*, frigate, Turkey
12. HMS *Northumberland*, frigate, United Kingdom
13. HNOMS *Utvaer*, submarine, Norway
14. HS *Posydon*, submarine, Greece
15. HNOMS *Saelen*, submarine, Greece [sic]
16. TCG *Zafer*, frigate, Turkey
17. TCG *Bartin*, corvette, Turkey

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Professor Maria Rasmussen
Department of National Security Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
4. Professor David Yost
Department of National Security Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
5. Krassi Kouzmanov
Euro-Atlantic Integration Directorate
Ministry of Defense
Sofia, Bulgaria